NPS ARCHIVE
1966
FETTE, E.

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

URUGUAYAN POLICY IN RESPECT TO THE UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IN APRIL, 1965 (AN EXAMINATION OF THE URUGUAYAN POSITION IN THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL)

by

Estal Joseph Fette

Submitted to the

Faculty of the School of International Service

of The American University

in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree

of

MASTER OF ARTS

Signatures of Committee:

Chairman: _____

_____

_____ Date: _____
Dean of the School

Date: _____

May, 1966

The American University
Washington, D. C.

NPS Archive
1966
Fette, E

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY CA 93943-5101

[illegible]

by

Ethel Joseph Fette

Submitted to the

Faculty of the School of International Service

of The American University

in Partial Fulfillment of

the Requirements for the Degree

of

MASTER OF ARTS

Signatures of Committee:

Chairman: _____

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the School

Date: _____

May, 1966

The American University
Washington, D. C.

Copyright by
Estal Joseph Fette
1966

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	URUGUAY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY	7
	Political Compromise and Constitutional Reform	7
	The Social Laboratory of the Americas	18
	Government Intervention in the Economy	22
	The Uruguayan Welfare State: An Overview . .	25
III.	CONTEMPORARY URUGUAYAN FOREIGN POLICY	30
	Relations with Argentina and Brazil	30
	Relations with the United States, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union	34
	Participation in Regional and Universal Organizations	37
	Current Problems in Foreign Policy Formulation	40
IV.	THE UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IN APRIL, 1965	43
	The Dominican Coup d'État	43
	Intervention on Humanitarian Grounds	49
	Intervention on Political Grounds: The So-Called Johnson Doctrine	51
V.	THE URUGUAYAN POSITION IN THE O.A.S.	58

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE ROAD TO THE REPUBLIC	7
	Political Geography and Demographics	
	Nature	7
	The Social Hierarchy of the Mountain	12
	Government Intervention in the Economy	23
	The Indigenous Culture Under the Spanish . .	25
III.	CONFRONTATION BETWEEN CHURCH AND STATE	30
	Relations with Indigenous and Local	30
	Relations with the United States, Mexico,	
	Europe, and the Soviet Union	34
	The Solidification in National and Universal	
	Opposition	37
	Current Tensions in Foreign Policy	
	Formulation	40
IV.	THE UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN THE	
	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IN APRIL, 1965	43
	The Constitutional Crisis	43
	Intervention or Humanitarian Mission	46
	Intervention or Political Domination: The	
	So-Called Johnson Doctrine	51
V.	THE DOMINICAN POSITION IN THE O.A.S.	58

CHAPTER PAGE

Opposition to the Convocation of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation 58

Disapproval of the U.S. Intervention 62

Support, with Reservations, for the OAS Special Commission to the Dominican Republic 68

Opposition to the Creation of the Inter-American Peace Force 69

VI. THE URUGUAYAN POSITION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL 73

Criticism of the U.S. Intervention 73

The Uruguayan Resolution of May 11, 1965: An Assertion of U.N. Competence in Regional Affairs 78

VII. CONCLUSIONS 87

BIBLIOGRAPHY 90

APPENDIX A. Resolution Convoking the Tenth Meeting of Consultation 95

APPENDIX B. Resolution Calling for Cease-Fire 97

APPENDIX C. Resolution Establishing O.A.S. Committee 98

APPENDIX D. Resolution Establishing Inter-American Force 99

CHAPTER PAGE

Opposition to the Connection of the
Tenth meeting of Committee 58
Disapproval of the U.S. Intervention 62
Support with Reservations, for the use
Special Committee to the Organization
Republic 68
Opposition to the Creation of the Inter-
American Peace Force 69
VI. THE UNDERLYING CAUSES IN THE UNION NATIONS
SECURITY COUNCIL 73
Criticism of the U.S. Intervention 73
The Uruguayan Resolution of May 21, 1965
No Objection of U.N. Competence in Regional
Aggression 76
VII. CONCLUSIONS 87
BIBLIOGRAPHY 90
APPENDIX A. Resolution Concerning the Tenth Meeting
of Consultation 95
APPENDIX B. Resolution Calling for Cease-Fire . . . 97
APPENDIX C. Resolution Ordering U.S.
Compliance 98
APPENDIX D. Resolution Prohibiting Three-Nation
Force 99

PAGE

APPENDIX E. Uruguayan Draft Resolution of May 11, 1965 101

APPENDIX F. Security Council Resolution of May 14, 1965 103

APPENDIX B. Security Council Resolution 82 101

May 29, 1960 101

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the long history of the development of the inter-American system, there has, perhaps, been no more important or controversial a question in the relations between states than that concerning the principle of nonintervention. Directed primarily against the "Colossus of the North" (though often disregarded in inter-Latin American relations), the principle was consistently advocated by Latin American diplomats during the period of U.S. interventionist policy in the Caribbean and Central America during the latter nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For the sake of brevity, suffice to say that at the Seventh International Conference of American States at Montevideo in December, 1933, following the advent of the Good Neighbor policy earlier that year, the principle of nonintervention was finally, and formally, established as the cornerstone of the inter-American system.

In 1965, that principle received its most serious challenge in over thirty years, for what began as a cuartelazo in the Dominican Republic on April 24 had, within three short weeks, developed into a major international issue. What made this so, first and foremost, was the unilateral intervention of the United States and the reasons given by

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

the Johnson Administration in explanation thereof. Not only was the underpinning of the inter-American system visibly weakened by the United States action, but there was also an indication to many that there had been a basic change in U.S. policy toward its Latin American neighbors. Some, for example, viewed the landing of American forces in Santo Domingo as the exercise of a new interventionist doctrine toward Latin America; while others, thinking in terms of U.S. global commitments, evaluated the action as an indication of intent to prevent, by military force if necessary, the establishment of communist régimes anywhere in the world.

It came as no surprise, therefore, to find that diplomatic activity--and not just that confined to the Western Hemisphere alone--could hardly keep pace with the events unfolding in the Dominican crisis. By the middle of May, moreover, there were present in the Dominican Republic, at one and the same time, representatives of the three major protagonists in the struggle: the United States, the Organization of American States, and the United Nations. Although the desire to restore peace in that island republic formed a common goal for their separate activities, other issues were at stake and the participants acted accordingly.

The major issue facing the Johnson Administration in the early days of the Dominican revolution was the possibility of the establishment of another Castro-communist type

of government in the Caribbean. The magnitude and duration of the U.S. intervention belied the original justification of intervening on humanitarian grounds, and Administration officials soon sought to multilaterialize the U.S. action by seeking the sanction of the Organization of American States.

The discomfiture felt in Washington, however, was no less acute than that experienced within the O.A.S. Having been asked for neither its advice nor its consent, the regional organization suddenly found itself on the horns of a dilemma. First, the principle of nonintervention, long regarded as the controlling dynamic of the inter-American system, was being placed in jeopardy; second, the continuing effectiveness of regional organizations within the framework of the United Nations was under serious attack. Under the circumstances, one was hardly surprised by the initial embarrassment and resentment shown by Latin American diplomats.

The issue was no less acute within the United Nations, although it tended to be overshadowed somewhat by the acrimonious debate between the two superpowers. In terms reminiscent of past US-USSR confrontations, the Soviet Union sought to gain as much political capital as possible out of the U.S. intervention, while the United States attempted to justify its actions before world opinion and called for a regional settlement of the dispute. The majority of member nations of the U.N., meanwhile, appeared less concerned with

the US-USSR conflict than with the decreasing prestige and effectiveness of the world organization in maintaining international peace and security.

Little Uruguay, with its long tradition of stable constitutional government, quickly emerged as one of the foremost critics of the U.S. intervention. Using both the O.A.S. and the U.N. Security Council as their forums, Uruguayan diplomats called for the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Dominican soil. Consistent with the strict Latin American juridical tradition, they repeatedly stressed the importance of observing the principles of the regional and universal organizations in the conduct of international relations. In particular, they voiced their concern over the so-called "Johnson Doctrine" which, in the Uruguayan interpretation, endangered the principle of nonintervention and the right of national self-determination.

It is the purpose of this thesis to examine the Uruguayan position in the O.A.S. and the United Nations Security Council, placing major emphasis upon the juridical framework in which Uruguayan foreign policy is formulated. At the same time, an analysis will be made of the extent to which Uruguayan foreign policy reflects both its domestic policy and its concern for the movement for social change in Latin America. Finally, this author attempts to assess the extent wo which the Uruguayan position was consistent with

the policies, both domestic and foreign, which that country has pursued during the twentieth century.

This author knows of no other research done on Uruguayan foreign policy *per se*. Past studies of Uruguay have dwelt mainly upon the advanced social and political institutions which have characterized that country since the beginning of the present century. It is hoped, therefore, that this thesis will further enlarge upon our knowledge of that small and strongly-democratic Latin American nation.

Concerning the bibliography, it should be noted that works in the English language relating to Uruguay, although generally excellent in nature, are rather few in number. They have, nevertheless, provided a solid foundation upon which to base the introductory chapters of this thesis. Chapters II and III, which describe modern Uruguay and the considerations influencing its foreign policy, rely mainly upon these secondary sources, especially the studies of Simon G. Hanson, Russell H. Fitzgibbon, George Pendle, and Philip B. Taylor, Jr. Chapter IV, describing the Dominican *coup* and the U.S. intervention, as well as Chapters V and VI, which examine the Uruguayan position in the O.A.S. and the U.N. relative to these events, are necessarily based upon the various primary sources listed in the bibliography, particularly the official documents and records of the O.A.S., the United Nations, and the U.S. Department of State, as

well as Uruguayan and U.S. news media. Regarding the latter, the interpretations of events occurring during the Dominican revolution were often at variance and, therefore, used with some caution in this thesis. The translation of the verbatim minutes of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation listed in the bibliography is by the author.

CHAPTER II

URUGUAY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The juridical orientation of Uruguayan foreign policy reflects very closely the juridical approach which Uruguayans have adopted for many years now toward their own domestic politics. Concerning the latter, it should be noted that no country in Latin America has had a longer tradition of stable constitutional government than has Uruguay. This reputation, more than any other, has distinguished that small nation from the majority of her sister republics in the twentieth century. The domestic policy responsible for this stability was initiated in the first decade of this century and has been firmly institutionalized within the Uruguayan environment. Political compromise, advanced social legislation, and government intervention in the economy have been the three major components of that policy.

I. POLITICAL COMPROMISE AND CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM

At the turn of the present century, Uruguay had reached that point in her national existence in which the decisions made in the next decade or two would be of vital importance in determining the direction of her future development. Either the tradition of caudillismo and civil

insurrection would continue to dominate the domestic scene, as it had since the time of Independence,[1] or a new departure could be taken which would improve the social and political environment of the country and pave the way for political stability and economic progress.

Before an examination is made of the course actually taken, however, a brief review of the Uruguayan environment in 1900 will be helpful. Lacking in Uruguay were many of the sources of internal division found in much of Latin America. Geographically, Uruguay was a small nation in which communication and transportation were unimpeded by natural barriers, such as existed in many other Latin American countries. Intense regionalism, therefore, was not a factor in Uruguayan history. Ethnically integrated, Uruguay contained no significant number of Indians or Negroes, and its population was almost entirely of European racial stock. Concerning religion, the Constitution of 1830 had recognized the Catholic Church as the religion of the State, yet the Church had never attained that position of political and economic

---

[1] "Of the twenty-five governments that guided the Uruguayan ship of state from 1830 to 1903, nine were forced out of power, two were liquidated by assassination and one by grave injury, ten resisted successfully one or more revolutions, and three were free of serious disturbance during their periods in office." Simon G. Hanson, Utopia in Uruguay. Chapters in the Economic History of Uruguay (New York: Oxford University Press, 1938), p. 3.

power which it had in other areas of Latin America. In addition, attempts to settle Uruguay were begun quite late in the colonial period, and the imprint of the Spanish colonial tradition was consequently very weak.

Economically, cattle and sheep raising provided the most important source of revenue for the small republic in the nineteenth century, and the stock-raising economy was one which lent itself to large-scale ownership of the land in a predominantly pastoral society. The introduction of the *frigorífico*, or meat-packing plant, in 1904, however, gave impetus to the rise of an urban labor class, whose ranks were augmented by wage-earners in the small industries and public utilities. A small urban middle class also began to appear at this time, consisting of the professional classes, government workers, and intellectuals. Urban labor and the middle class were centered primarily in Montevideo--the capital of Uruguay and its major port.

Concerning domestic politics, Uruguay had a tradition of political parties dating back to the 1830's. Throughout most of the nineteenth century, however, the Blancos and Colorados--the two major parties--were characterized more by their support of rival *caudillos* than by sharp differences in party ideology;[2] the result, more often than not, was

---

[2]In the modern period, the Colorados have been

[illegible]

authoritarian government under *caudillo* presidents. In the latter decades of the century, Colorado strength began to gravitate toward the cities, while the Blancos found their support among the *estancieros* in the rural areas. At the same time, the immigration of tens of thousands of Europeans "who had no part in the inherited political quarrels"[3] thinned the ranks of native-born Uruguayans and had a noticeable influence on the trend toward political stability.

It was during these latter decades of the nineteenth century that Uruguay made a unique contribution to Latin American political practice through its introduction of the "pact of the parties," or political compromise, in which the two rival parties settled certain of their political differences.[4] This *modus vivendi* achieved periods of peace in

---

closely identified with the urban middle and lower classes and have endorsed liberal social and economic policies. The Blancos, who have been more conservative on economic and social issues, have traditionally represented the rural landowning interests. Both parties, however, contain liberal and conservative factions, making precise definition of party ideology rather difficult. For a fuller description of Uruguay's political parties, see Philip B. Taylor, Jr., *Government and Politics of Uruguay* (New Orleans: Tulane University Press, 1960), pp. 43-68.

[3]Russell H. Fitzgibbon, *Uruguay, Portrait of a Democracy* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954), p. 26.

[4]Taylor, *op. cit.*, pp. 17-21. Johnson also speaks of "the spirit of compromise that has pervaded Uruguayan politics" during this century. John J. Johnson, *Political Change in Latin America. The Emergence of the Middle Sectors* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958), pp. 60-62.

domestic politics and ensured the survival of the opposition Blanco party at a time when the Colorados were gaining a clear dominance in the central government in Montevideo.

These, then, were the dominant aspects of the Uruguayan environment in 1903, the year which marks the beginning of the modern period of Uruguayan politics.[5] In March of that year, there was elected to the presidency José Batlle y Ordóñez, an extraordinary politician who reorganized the political, social, and economic order of Uruguay so thoroughly that civilian government, under the constitution, has characterized the Uruguayan scene ever since.[6]

The program adopted by Batlle during his first term of office (1903-1907) was one aimed at the establishment of honest government and political stability. "'I am convinced,' he said, 'that the remedy for all our ills lies in electoral freedom, in honest elections.'"[7] The Blancos, however, under the leadership of Aparicio Saravia, rose against the government in 1903-1904, fearing Colorado encroachment on their control of certain territorial departments won earlier

---

[5]Taylor, op. cit., p. 17.

[6]A brief departure from this tradition occurred in 1933 during the Great Depression, infra, p. 16.

[7]El Tiempo [Montevideo], January 23, 1903, cited by Hanson, op. cit., p. 19.

their control of certain territorial departments was waning.

---

[5] Taylor, op. cit., p. 17.

[6] A brief description from this eradition occurred in 1933 during the Chaco Defensive, Infra, p. 16.

[7] El Tiempo (Bogotá), January 23, 1904, cited by Hanson, op. cit., p. 19.

as the price of peace.[8] The civil war which resulted was the last in Uruguay's history and ended in the unification of the country. Batlle used his victory over the Blancos "as a means for final establishment of central governmental control over the entire national territory rather than as the basis for a further territorial partitioning of the country between the two parties."[9]

In addition to his decisive victory over the Blancos in 1904, Batlle sought to reorganize the Colorado party and to free it from "the taint resulting from the support it had given to odious dictators in the past."[10] Under his leadership the power of the conservative, oligarchical, and corrupt forces within the party was weakened, and the urban lower and middle classes were permitted, even encouraged, to enter the political process. This was done not only for idealistic reasons but for sound political reasons as well, since an enlarged popular base of support of the Colorado party would ensure its continued electoral success.[11]

Batlle stepped down from office in 1907 "without

---

[8]A pact in 1897 recognized Blanco control over six of the nineteen departments into which the country is divided. Milton I. Vanger, José Batlle y Ordóñez of Uruguay (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 13.

[9]Taylor, op. cit., p. 111.

[10]Ibid.

[11]Ibid.

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [

having formulated or offered a well-articulated progressive program,"[12] yet he had done much toward ending the chaos which had plagued Uruguay during the preceding three-quarters of a century. He had, moreover, observed that clause of the still valid Constitution of 1830 which prohibited a president from succeeding himself in office.

After four years of travel abroad,[13] Batlle returned to Uruguay in 1911 and was elected by the Congress to a second four-year term in office. Within two months, "he launched the most progressive administration in Uruguayan history."[14] In addition to widespread social reform, he advocated popular rather than legislative election of the national president, together with proportional representation in the Congress.

Batlle's greatest battle, however, centered around his proposal for a nine-member collegiate executive.[15] He felt, with much justification, that the basic problems of Uruguayan governments in the past had stemmed primarily from

---

[12]Hanson, op. cit., p. 20.

[13]Batlle visited several countries in Western Europe between 1907 and 1911, studying their forms of government.

[14]Hanson, op. cit., p. 20.

[15]Taylor discusses the pros and cons of the argument that Batlle's collegiate executive plan was inspired by his observation of the Swiss executive. Taylor, op. cit., p. 167, fn. 74.

dictatorship and political instability. Strong presidents, handpicking their own successors, had substituted electoral frauds for honest elections and had contributed to the perennial cycle of revolution, dictatorship, and political repression so common in Latin America. An executive council, he argued, would prevent the gravitation of power into the hands of a single strong leader and would enlist the voter's faith in the use of the ballot.

Opposition to Batlle's program was strongest among the Blancos and the conservative minority of the Colorado party, while the majority wing of the Colorados, under Batlle's control, backed the proposed reforms. His second term ended, however, before he could gather enough support for such radical innovations.

The Colorado party, still under Batlle's leadership and enjoying a wide base of popular support built up during his two terms in office, continued to dominate the Uruguayan political scene after their leader stepped down from the Presidency in 1915. In the following year, a constitutional convention was elected to consider the issue of the collegiate executive and other constitutional changes. Though supporting several of Batlle's proposals, an important fraction of the party opposed him on the question of executive reform and, hence, the Batllistas were unable to control the convention. Their threat to push through the

Congress in 1918 his election to a third term in the Presidency eventually brought forth a compromise solution, however, and the result was that the country acquired both a president and a council.[16]

As provided by the constitution adopted in 1918, the President was to be elected for a four-year term by a simple popular plurality (no longer by the Congress) and would have within his power the appointment of the ministers of foreign relations, war and navy, and interior. Sharing the executive power was an independent National Council of Administration--a popularly-elected body of nine members chosen from the two major parties--which would have control over the ministries of labor, public welfare, finance, industry, public instruction, and public works.

Also written into the Constitution of 1918 were proportional representation, the secret ballot, the complete separation of Church and State, greater autonomy for municipalities and territorial departments, and tentative steps toward suffrage for women. As a result of these constitutional reforms, elections became more orderly, the attempt to perpetuate régimes through electoral frauds ceased,

---

[16]For a scholarly treatment of the development of Uruguay's executive branch of government, see Philip B. Taylor, Jr., The Executive Power in Uruguay (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1951).

Congress in 1910 was elected on a third term in the tradi-
tional sense, and the result was that authority devolved upon a
president and a council.[16]

In contrast to the centralization achieved in Italy, the
Fascists tried to be elected for a five-year term by a simple
popular majority (the Acerbo Act). Mussolini and would have
taken his power from the appointment of the ministers of foreign
relations, war and navy, and interior. Instead the execu-
tive power was in Mussolini's hands; Council of Ministers
presidency--a position clearly not a rival position comes
from the two major parties--must still have control over
the budgetary issue; public welfare; finance, industry,
public instruction, and public works.

Also written into the Constitution of 1923 were two
territorial representation, the party delist, the complete
separation of Church and State, private economy and manufac-
tures and corporative organization, and executive power
toward authority for women. As a result of these constitu-
tional reforms, elections became more orderly, the executive
to perpetuate regimes through electoral fraud ceased,

---

[16]For a popularly traditional of the development of
Germany's executive branch of government, see Duffy &
Taylor, W., The Executive Branch in Transition (Berkeley:
California: University of California Press, 1921).

guarantees of free speech and free press were respected, and faith in democratic institutions was achieved.

So effective was Batlle's reorganization and popularization of the Colorado party that it retained its position as the majority party after his death in 1929. The Blancos, long since reduced to the role of the "loyal opposition," were nevertheless assured of representation in the National Council of Administration, as well as in the General Assembly and in provincial administration. Political compromise and constitutional reform had once again removed a potential cause for revolution.

In 1933, due in large part to the world economic crisis, Uruguay witnessed its only coup d'état in this century.[17] President Terra, feeling that the 1918 Constitution denied him sufficient power to legislate emergency economic measures, declared himself dictator and dissolved the National Council of Administration and the General Assembly. There resulted a mild dictatorship aimed at the restoration of economic stability; personal freedoms, however, were not severely limited. Although economic recovery was accomplished between 1933 and 1938, the Terra régime represented

---

[17]For details of the 1933 coup d'état, see Philip B. Taylor, Jr., "The Uruguayan Coup d'état of 1933," The Hispanic American Historical Review, Vol. XXXII (August, 1952), pp. 301-320.

a marked departure from the tradition of constitutional government begun by Batlle. According to Taylor, "the coup of 1933 is not often discussed openly in Uruguay; it tends to be sotto voce, for Uruguayans do not enjoy discussing something of which they are ashamed."[18] In 1942, constitutional democratic government returned to Uruguay with the adoption of a new constitution and the holding of national elections.

In 1951, there occurred yet another constitutional reform affecting the executive branch of government.[19] The Blancos, though traditionally opposed to the collegiate plan, had long since despaired of capturing the Presidency through elections and began to view a council of government as the only means by which they could share in the control of the executive power. Therefore, they supported a Colorado proposal in 1951 that the collegiate executive be re-established, this time in its pure form. As subsequently approved by national plebiscite, a new constitution was adopted in 1951 which abolished the Presidency and established a National Council of Government (NCG) consisting of

---

[18] Ibid., p. 319.

[19] Pendle considers constitutional reform as "the principle issue in Uruguayan politics." George Pendle, Uruguay (second edition; London: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 29.

nine members, six of whom came from the party receiving the largest number of votes and three from the next most-voted party. The presidency of the NCG rotated annually among the majority party members. Mainly protocolary in nature, the President's powers did not differ substantially from those of the other members of the Council. Batlle's dream of a collegiate executive had at last been realized in the form which he had originally intended.

The Colorado party suffered its first defeat in national elections in more than ninety years when, in 1958, the Blancos--or Nationalists, as they are now called--won the election by a margin of 120,000 votes.[20] In 1962, they managed to retain their majority in the NCG by a thin margin of 24,000 votes out of more than 1,000,000 votes cast. The election scheduled for 1966 will undoubtedly prove to be an equally-close contest.

II. THE SOCIAL LABORATORY OF THE AMERICAS

A widespread movement for social change, noticeable in virtually every part of the world, has become one of the dominant features in man's milieu in the twentieth century. Whether it be in Latin America or in Africa, in Asia or in

---

[20]Voting statistics of national elections held between 1925 and 1958 are tabulated in Taylor, Government and Politics of Uruguay, op. cit., Appendix B.

[illegible] Congress, 1st Sess., Appendix 8.

the United States, its general characteristics have been much the same: the attempt by a significant part of society to abolish, or at least to ameliorate, the social inequities of the past; their movement for assimilation within the body politics; and their search for a more equitable distribution of the fruits of man's labor.

In Latin America, as elsewhere, this movement has brought about basic changes in the structure of society as well as in the political process of the nation. Furthermore, it has come about either violently, as for example in Mexico, or peacefully, as in Uruguay. In fact, these two countries provide a striking contrast when viewing the movement for social change in Latin America in the twentieth century. Mexico, which inherited a strong colonial tradition, accented the disparity between the privileged classes of society and the laboring masses and provided an environment in which change was brought about only after a decade or more of civil strife. Uruguay, possessing little of the colonial tradition and favored with a homogeneous population, was able to achieve social reform without disrupting the constitutional process.

The social revolution led by Batlle in the first quarter of the twentieth century preceded by several years the more widely-publicized Mexican revolution. Unlike the idealist Francisco Madero, who sought only political reform,

Batlle was a practical politician and realized that lasting political stability could only be achieved by assimilating within the body politic "the forgotten man" of society--the urban worker. Hence, his program of social reform proceeded apace with that of constitutional reform. Under these conditions, the seeds of violent political and social revolution were never permitted to germinate.

Combining the influence of his newspaper, El Día, with his domination of national politics, Batlle pushed through the Congress during the first three decades of this century a body of enlightened labor and social legislation which has earned for Uruguay the reputation of being the "social laboratory of the Americas." As early as 1905, a bill legalizing divorce was enacted over the opposition of the conservative classes and the clergy. Later that same year, relief from income taxes was granted to the lowest-paid public officials and those receiving small pensions. In 1914, compensation for industrial accidents was enacted into law.

Batlle's fight for the eight-hour day, begun in 1907, was pressed relentlessly until its enactment in November, 1915, together with his proposal for a forty-eight-hour week. Limited to urban male wage earners, the bill received little support from rural workers, while the wealthy land-owning class, normally conservative, opposed such radical

legislation. Industry in Montevideo, especially the foreign-owned sector, was also against the proposed bill. Batlle's victory over such formidable opposition accented both his personal leadership and the pro-labor orientation of his party. Concerning further social reform, he wrote, in El Día on October 24, 1915:

> You have not seen anything yet, for we are going to have not only an eight-hour day but also old-age and retirement pensions, a day of rest in every six, and many other social laws; seremos una pobre y oscura republiquita pero tendremos leyecitas adelantaditas.[21]

In 1919, legislation providing for old-age pensions was adopted, followed in 1923 by the passage of a minimum wage law.

Batlle's advanced social philosophy and reform program continued after his death in 1929. In 1933, the Uruguayan government promulgated the first in a series of laws concerning vacations with pay, while in 1939 a beginning was made in legislating workers' unemployment compensation. Four years later, a bill was passed which provided special allowances to lower-income employees, in addition to their regular salaries, to help them support dependent children, whether legitimate or illegitimate. In the following year, compensation upon dismissal was enacted into law.

Regarding education, Uruguay boasts one of the lowest

---

[21] Hanson, op. cit., p. 125.

[illegible] Industry to Mercyhood, especially the [illegible]-owned smelter, was also behind the proposed bill. Hattie's victory over such formidable opposition boosted both his personal leadership and the pro-labor orientation of his party. Concerning further events before, he wrote, in [illegible] on October 26, 1911:

> [illegible] have not seen anything yet. For we are going to have not only an eight-hour day but also old-age and retirement pensions, a day of rest in every six, and many other social laws! Estamos una poderosa y osadas [illegible] very important legislation.[23]

In 1912, legislation providing for old-age pensions was adopted, followed in 1913 by the passage of a minimum wage law.

Hattie's advanced social philosophy and reform program continued after his death in 1918. In 1919, the Pennsylvania Legislature [illegible] in a series of laws concerning vocations with pay. While in 1937 a beginning was made in legislating workers' unemployment compensation. Four years later, a bill was passed which provided special allowances to lower-income employees, in addition to their regular salaries, to help them support dependents/ children, whether legitimate or illegitimate. In the following year, compensation upon disability was enacted into law.

Imparting education, Hattie gave at the lowest

---

[23] Hudson, op. cit., p. 129.

illiteracy rates in Latin America. As a result of the work begun in the 1870's by José Pedro Varela, whom Fitzgibbon describes as "second only to José Batlle y Ordóñez,"[22] and, as a result of the educational reforms adopted during the present century, elementary education is now free and compulsory in Uruguay. In addition, secondary and technical schools, as well as the University of Montevideo, are also available to all, free of cost, although incidental expenses, such as room and board, must be borne by the student and are thereby limiting factors on enrollment.

III. GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION IN THE ECONOMY

Parallel to the political and social reforms achieved in Uruguay during this century were the economic measures which produced in Uruguay a modified state socialism.

In 1911, at the beginning of his second term in office, Batlle argued that:

> The sphere of state intervention is expanding in every civilized country. . . . The modern state unhesitatingly accepts its status as an economic organization. It will enter industry when competition is not practicable, when control by private interests vests in them authority inconsistent with the welfare of the State, when a fiscal monopoly may serve as a great source of income to meet urgent tax problems, when the continued export of national wealth is considered undesirable.[23]

---

[22] Fitzgibbon, op. cit., p. 198.

[23] Diario de Sesiones de la H. Cámara de Representantes,

Convinced that state ownership was in the public interest, Batlle urged the Legislature to create government monopolies in the basic sector of the economy. In 1911, therefore, nationalization of the Banco de la República was effected, followed at the end of the year by the establishment of a State insurance bank, initially limited to fire, life, and workmen's compensation but extended by law in 1926 to cover all risks. In 1912, the ownership and operation of electric services and the production of industrial chemicals were made State monopolies. Postal, telegraph, and telephone facilities became public corporations in 1915, and during the First World War, the State commenced its plan to purchase the British-owned and operated railway system. By 1949, Uruguay owned virtually all of the railway system serving the country.

In 1928, the Uruguayan government entered the meat-packing business by creating the Frigorífico Nacional--one of the four frigoríficos in the country today, the other three being owned by American and British interests. In 1931, the production of petroleum, alcohol, and portland cement became a State monopoly, and in 1932, the port authority in Montevideo came under government control. A

CCXII (1911), p. 79, cited by Hanson, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

State-owned airline was created in 1944 to serve the interior, replacing the former privately-owned airline.

The creation of State monopolies resulted "less from any strong belief in fundamental social theories"[24] than from the argument that "efficiency of the foreigner merely increased the amount of dividends sent abroad without aiding domestic industry, while the State, when guilty of overstaffing or of paying excessively high wages, added to domestic purchasing power."[25]

Extended government intervention in the economy has produced rather favorable results throughout most of the present century. Ownership by the State has generally provided satisfactory service in the public utilities; a privately-owned domestic industry has been allowed to grow under the protection provided by the State against foreign competition; the benefits of jobs in the government bureaucracy and in the public corporations are comparable to those found in private industry; and urban labor occupies a favored position in the national economy as compared to many areas of Latin America.

While government participation in industry has produced many of the foregoing desired results, it has also

---

[24]Johnson, op. cit., p. 56.

[25]Hanson, op. cit., p. 24.

---

[33] Jamison, op. cit., p. 94.

created certain disadvantages, the most noticeable being the very large number of persons employed in the bureaucracy and public corporations who are directly dependent upon government salaries. Speaking of "overpadded personnel rolls," Fitzgibbon states that

> . . . three-fourths or more of the budget is normally allocated for payment of personnel and 20 per cent or more of the whole Uruguayan population (including family members) depend for their livelihood on wages, salaries, or other income from the government.[26]

To sustain its economy, Uruguay depends primarily upon the maintenance of a favorable balance of trade in which wool, wheat, beef, and hides are the chief exports. Both productivity and exports, however, have declined in recent years, resulting in an unfavorable balance of trade. This, in turn, has led to a serious decrease in gold reserves, spiraling inflation, an increased cost of living, and strikes for higher wages.

IV. THE URUGUAYAN WELFARE STATE: AN OVERVIEW

Because of the relation between domestic and foreign policy, it would be well at this point to summarize the political, social, and economic aspects of the Uruguayan

---

[26]Fredrick B. Pike (ed.), Freedom and Reform in Latin America (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959), pp. 249-250.

environment mentioned previously in order to arrive at a meaningful overview of that nation's present domestic situation.

Politically, the measures adopted in Uruguay since 1903 have made "the government more democratically responsive and a significant fraction of the people more politically conscious and articulate than in any other country of Latin America."[27] Uruguayan governments, under predominantly middle class leadership, have functioned in a society in which the traditional power of the Church and the military are of only minor significance. Urban labor, which has been wooed for over half a century by progressive social and labor legislation, forms a solid base of support for the predominant Colorado party. Compromise has frequently been used as a political tactic, thereby obviating potential causes for revolution by a dissident minority. In addition, faith in the ballot, the resort to constitutional reform rather than revolution, and respect for individual rights and liberties have made of Uruguay a strong constitutional democracy.

Socially, the measures adopted in Uruguay in the past sixty years have made of that small country the first welfare state in the Americas. A long list of social and labor

---

[27] Ibid., p. 234.

environment maintained previously in order to strive at a meaningful overview of that region's present domestic situation.

Politically, the measures adopted in Germany since 1933 have made the government more democratically responsive and a significantly fraction of the people more politically conscious and articulate than in any other country of Latin America.[37] Germany possesses, under moderate-nearly middle class leadership, been functioned in a society in which the traditional power of the church and the military are of only minor significance. Urban labor, which has been wooed for over half a century by progressive social and labor legislation, forms a solid base of support for the predominant Christian party. Communism has frequently been used as a political cancer, thereby obviating potential causes for revolution by a dictatorial minority. In addition, faith in the ballot, the resort to constitutional reform rather than revolution, and respect for individual rights and liberties have made of Europe a strong constitutional democracy.

Socially, the economy adopted in Germany in the past sixty years has made of that small country the first welfare state in the Americas. A long list of social and labor

---

[37] Ibid., p. 218.

legislation, guaranteed under the Constitution, has prompted Fitzgibbon to say that "the bodily and the social ills of Uruguayans are responsibilities weighing more heavily on the public conscience than can be said of any other Latin American country."[28] Because of this, the Communist party has found meager opportunity to influence Uruguayan society. Uruguay's social legislation and general lack of poverty have not provided fertile ground for the traditional communist appeal, although the party has been accorded almost complete freedom in its activities.

Economically--and here we approach the crucial issue facing Uruguay today--government intervention has served to provide a satisfactory business atmosphere until the past decade. Prior to the 1950's, a favorable balance of trade was normally maintained, domestic industry was promoted, public corporations provided satisfactory services in the basic sector of the economy, and the peso was sound. Since mid-1950, however, due to the increasing cost of the welfare state and the decline in productivity and exports, Uruguay has increasingly encountered an unfavorable balance of trade and serious inflation. In 1963, for the first time, Uruguay's gold reserves became practically nonexistent; production, which decreased 10 per cent in 1962, dropped even

---

[28]Fitzgibbon, op. cit., p. 184.

---

[18] Fitzgibbon, op. cit., p. 114.

lower in 1963; the average work week was only twenty-five hours; the only productive increase was in the cattle industry; and imports exceeded exports by over fifteen million dollars.[29] Uruguayans, used to the good life provided by the welfare state, have as yet failed to adopt the austerity measures required to reverse these trends. The country's first comprehensive government-sponsored economic survey, completed at the end of 1963, reported that the gross national product had been declining since 1955, and that social security and welfare benefits were more expensive than Uruguay could afford unless something were done to spur productivity and exports.[30] Added to this is the fact that 20 per cent of the working force is dependent on government salaries.

Because of the inevitable correlation between economics and politics, the Uruguayan economy must soon be stabilized if its governmental system is to remain secure. Measures have already been taken, with additional reforms certain to follow. The election of 1958, which brought the opposition Blanco party into power, gave evidence of dissatisfaction with the unsound economic climate which developed in recent years under the leadership of the

---

[29] The New York Times, January 17, 1964.

[30] Ibid., March 1, 1964.

developed in recent years under the leadership of the

---

[25] *The New York Times*, January 17, 1964.

[26] *Ibid.*, March 1, 1964.

Colorados. Although some reforms have already been initiated, a major austerity program has not yet been adopted because of the difficulty of decision-making in a bifurcated executive which diffuses authority and responsibility. A national plebiscite scheduled for 1966 to consider the re-establishment of the office of President and the dissolution of the National Council of Government could result in a step which would enhance the passage of effective economic legislation. This, in turn, would do much toward improving the domestic stability so necessary for effective foreign policy formulation.

CHAPTER III

CONTEMPORARY URUGUAYAN FOREIGN POLICY

A review of contemporary Uruguayan foreign policy provides the student of international relations with a striking and generally refreshing contrast to that of the majority of Latin American republics. Whereas boundary disputes, revolutions, and interventions have been rather commonplace in Hispanic-America, they have been almost completely absent in Uruguay's relations with its neighbors and the international community. Pendle has observed:

> It is evident that the Uruguayans have transported into the sphere of international deliberations the convictions which, since the year 1903, have determined the social and economic development of their own country.[1]

I. RELATIONS WITH ARGENTINA AND BRAZIL

Uruguay's foreign policy and freedom of action on the international scene have been influenced considerably by its position between Argentina and Brazil. Granted independence in 1828, through British mediation, as a small buffer state between the two giants of South America, Uruguay suffered the intervention of one or the other of its two powerful

---

[1] George Pendle, Uruguay (second edition; London: Oxford University Press, 1957), p. 79.

neighbors at various times throughout much of the nineteenth century. By 1903, however, Uruguay no longer had reason to fear for its sovereignty, and its territorial boundaries were well established.

Uruguayan relations with Argentina and Brazil in the contemporary era have been affected primarily by the following considerations: geographic proximity; Argentine and Brazilian ambitions in the past toward Uruguay; differences in size, population, and resources; and long-standing antipathy between the peoples of Uruguay and Argentina which would make politically unpopular any undue deference to Argentina on the part of an Uruguayan government. Because of these factors, Uruguay has sought "to use some other large nation as a counterweight to Argentina."[2] Brazil has traditionally filled that role, although, particularly since the 1940's, the United States and membership in the O.A.S. and the U.N. have offered additional means of guaranteeing Uruguayan sovereignty.

One of the most important areas of conflict in Uruguayan-Argentine relations has been the granting of asylum to Argentine political refugees. This was particularly a source of friction during the régime of President

---

[2]Philip B. Taylor, Jr., The Executive Power in Uruguay (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1951), p. 94.

---

[2] Philip B. Taylor, Jr., The Executive Power in Mexican (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1951), p. 44.

Perón (1946-1955). Perón launched a campaign to try to prevent Argentine political exiles from being allowed to attack his government on the Uruguayan radio and in the press. Since Uruguay refused to limit the freedom of speech of exiled anti-Perónistas, Argentina retaliated by imposing travel restrictions which virtually cut off all tourist traffic between the two countries, thereby removing one of Uruguay's chief sources of revenue.[3] The Rodríguez Larreta doctrine of 1945, regarding collective inter-American intervention in the internal affairs of nations with dictatorial regimes,[4] was directed primarily against Argentina and coincided with the beginning of an anti-Perón movement in United States foreign policy.[5] Although the U.S. quickly endorsed the Uruguayan foreign minister's proposal, it was rejected by the majority of Latin American republics who were unwilling to modify significantly the principle of nonintervention. After Perón's downfall in 1955, travel restrictions were immediately lifted, thereby restoring to Uruguay a needed source of revenue.

---

[3]Uruguay's gross receipts from tourism fell from the equivalent of about $22 million in 1948 to $6 million in 1954. International Monetary Fund, cited by Pendle, op. cit., p. 52.

[4]"Inter-American Solidarity: Safeguarding the Democratic Ideal," U.S. Department of State Bulletin, XIII (November 25, 1945), pp. 864-866.

[5]Taylor, op. cit., pp. 94-95.

[illegible] (1830-1852). Pedro Ignacio's campaign to lay to pa-
vant Argentine political strife then being allowed to attack
his government on the Uruguayan south and in the ocean.
Since Urquiza refused to limit the freedom of speech of
exiled anti-Peronistas, Argentina retaliated by imposing
travel restrictions which virtually cut off all tourist
traffic between the two countries, nearly ruining one of
Urquiza's chief sources of revenue.[2] The doctrine Estrada
doctrine of 1931, requesting political non-intervention inter-
vention in the internal affairs of nations with diplomatic
regimes,[3] was dismissed ultimately as just legislating and cover-
ciated with the beginning of an anti-fascist movement in United
States foreign policy.[4] Although the U.S. quickly changed
the Uruguayan foreign minister's proposal, it was rejected
by the majority of Latin American republics who were unwill-
ing to nearly eliminate the principle of nonintervention.
After Perón's downfall in 1955, formal relations were
immediately lifted, thereby cutting to nothing a needed
source of revenue.

---

[1] Uruguay's gross receipts from tourism fell from the equivalent of about $17 million in 1949 to $8 million in 1954. Inconsequential Monetary Fact, cited by Fabris, op. cit., pp. 321.

[2] Tuber-Mentioned Neutrality, Delgumenting the Mexi-can Canal," U.S. Department of State Bulletin, XIII (November 25, 1945), pp. 880-881.

[3] Taylor, op. cit., pp. 84-93.

Since 1955, Uruguayan-Argentine relations have been quite amicable, and negotiations between the two countries have mainly concerned commerce in the Plata River area. A new Treaty of Friendship and Commerce was negotiated in 1956, followed in 1957 by an agreement to set up an Argentine-Uruguayan Commission to resolve national boundaries along the Uruguay River.[6] In 1960, Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay joined Chile, Peru, Paraguay, and Mexico in negotiating the Treaty of Montevideo, which established the Latin American Free Trade Area (LAFTA).[7]

Relations with Brazil in the twentieth century have been particularly amicable. The Colorados, who governed Uruguay continuously from 1865 to 1958, have always inclined toward Brazil. Relations between the two countries were strained briefly in 1935 when Getulio Vargas charged Montevideo communists with fomenting revolutionary activities in Brazil. Uruguay, in turn, broke off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, charging use of the Soviet legation

---

[6]Secretaria del Senado, República Oriental del Uruguay, Tratados y Convenios Internacionales (Montevideo: 1960), Vol. II, p. 515.

[7]For a concise treatment of LAFTA, see Albert O. Hirschman (ed.), Latin American Issues (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 1961), pp. 128-133.

in the capital as a communist propaganda center for much of southern South America.[8]

Treaties and conventions negotiated in the last two decades have primarily concerned the promotion of transportation and trade. A new Treaty of Commerce and Navigation was signed in 1949,[9] and in 1960 the creation of LAFTA obligated the two countries to even closer economic cooperation.

II. RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES, WESTERN EUROPE, AND THE SOVIET UNION

Uruguay's relations with the United States in the twentieth century have been, on the whole, very friendly. Sympathy for U.S. policy in both world wars led to the revocation of Uruguay's neutrality decrees vis-à-vis the Allies. In World War II, this led to the acceptance of U.S. financial and technical assistance in establishing naval and air bases for the defense of the Americas against Nazi submarine warfare.

During the postwar period, Uruguay's policy toward the United States has generally been sympathetic in respect

---

[8]Taylor, op. cit., p. 92; Russell H. Fitzgibbon, Uruguay: Portrait of a Democracy (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954), p. 255.

[9]Secretaría del Senado, República Oriental del Uruguay, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 479.

[illegible] as a commodity comparable [illegible] work of
workers South America.[3]

[illegible] and competition negotiated in the late [illegible]
decades have gradually consumed the investment [illegible]
labor and trade. A new treaty on commerce and navigation
was signed in 1949,[4] and in 1960 the creation of LAFTA facili-
tated the two countries to move closer economic relations.

[illegible] with the United States as one
[illegible] century have been, on the whole, very friendly
[illegible] for U.S. policy in Latin America as Congress's constantly declared wish to see the
Latin American republics [illegible] the U.S. [illegible]
and technical assistance in mutually beneficial ways) may have
[illegible] the defense of the Americas against Nazi aggression was-
[illegible].

During the postwar period, Chilean's policy toward
the United States has generally been committed to improved

---

[3]Taylor, op. cit., p. 317; Dunkel in "Introduction,"
Dunning, Democracy at a Crossroads (New York: Harcourt, Brace,
Butchess Publishers, 1956), p. 257.

[4]Secretaria del Senado, Compilacion Ordenada del
Derecho, op. cit., Vol. 1, p. 419.

to Cold War issues. For example, the United States has been able to count on Uruguay's vote in the U.N. General Assembly on major issues affecting the interests of the United States. Specifically, Uruguay voted in favor of the Uniting for Peace Resolution in 1950, voted against admission of Communist China to the U.N., and supported the U.S. position in the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. In matters of a strictly regional nature, however, Uruguay has steered a more diverging course as, for instance, in 1964, when it opposed the application of economic sanctions against Cuba and the breaking of diplomatic relations.[10] Though being on record against the sanctions imposed by the Ninth Meeting of Consultation, it has, nevertheless, complied with them.

Treaties with the United States date back to 1852 when the first Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation was concluded between the two countries. In 1905, a Treaty of Extradition of Criminals was signed. Economic relations with the United States are of major importance, however, and the U.S. has been the principal supplier of Uruguay's imports and a leading market for its exports in recent years. Uruguay, moreover, does not rely upon U.S. government loans

---

[10] OAS, Novena Reunión de Consulta de Ministros de Relaciones Exteriores para Servir de Órgano de Consulta en Aplicación del Tratado Interamericano de Asistencia Recíproca (Washington: Pan American Union, 1964), Document 58, p. 7.

Uruguay, moreover, does not rely upon U.S. governments like
ports and a leading market for its exports in recent years.
the U.S. has been the principal supplier of Uruguay's im-
with the United States are of major importance, however, and
of Extradition of Criminals was signed. Economic relations
was concluded between the two countries. In 1905, a Treaty
when the First Treaty of Friendship, Commerce and Navigation
Treaties with the United States date back to 1852

against the sanctions imposed by the Ninth Meeting of Con-
sultation is bar, nevertheless, coupled with those
breakup of diplomatic relations.[10] Though being on record
application of economic sanctions against Cuba and the
region, however, Uruguay has observed a more diverg-
the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. In matters of a strictly
Face Resolution in 1950, voted against admission of Commu-
nist China to the U.N., and supported the U.S. position in
Specifically, Uruguay voted in favor of the meeting for
on major issues affecting the interests of the United States.
able to count on Uruguay's vote in the U.N. General Assembly
to Cuba was issues. For example, the United States has been

[10] Cf. Novena Reunión de Consulta de Ministros de Relaciones Exteriores para Servir de Organo de Consulta en Aplicación del Tratado Interamericano de Asistencia Recíproca (Washington: Pan American Union, 1964), Document 56, p. 7.

and grants as do a number of Latin American nations. During the period 1946-1958, it received 0.6 per cent of the total U.S. loans and grants to Latin America.[11] Uruguay's political stability and economic progress in the first half of this century enabled it to rely mainly upon normal commercial channels for economic development rather than upon direct U.S. aid.

Uruguay's relations with Western Europe in recent decades have been mainly economic in nature. Great Britain has traditionally been a chief market for Uruguayan beef, wool, and hides, while West Germany has emerged since WW II as the second most important European market for its products. In 1960, Great Britain and West Germany together absorbed 33 per cent of Uruguay's exports while providing 15 per cent of its imports.[12] Trade with the nations of Western Europe will continue to receive prime attention in an effort to promote greater economic development.

Concerning the U.S.S.R., Uruguay was the first Latin American nation to renew diplomatic relations with that

---

[11]United States Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States-Latin American Relations (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 477.

[12]Banco Comercial [Montevideo], "Información económica del Uruguay: El comercio exterior en el año 1960," cited by Pan American Union, Uruguay, American Republics Series No. 20 (Washington, 1962), pp. 46-47.

and counts as do a number of Latin American nations. During the period 1940-1950, it received 0.5 per cent of the total U.S. loans and grants to Latin America.[13] Uruguay's political stability and economic progress in the first half of this century enabled it to rely mainly upon normal commercial channels for economic development rather than upon direct U.S. aid.

Uruguay's relations with Western Europe in recent decades have been mainly economic in nature. Great Britain has traditionally been a chief market for Uruguayan beef, wool, and hides, while West Germany has emerged since WW II as the second most important European market for its products. In 1960, Great Britain and West Germany together absorbed 15 per cent of Uruguay's exports while receiving 15 per cent of its imports.[14] Trade with the nations of Western Europe will continue to receive prime attention in an effort to promote greater economic development.

Concerning the U.S.S.R., Uruguay was the first Latin American nation to renew diplomatic relations with that

---

[13]United States Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States-Latin American Relations (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960), p. 417.

[14]Banco Comercial (Montevideo), "Intercambio económico del Uruguay: El comercio exterior en el año 1960," cited by Pan American Union, Uruguay, American Republics Series No. 20 (Washington, 1962), pp. 58-62.

country after WW I, exchanging representatives in 1926. Relations were severed in 1935, however, because of subversive activities of Russian legation officials in Montevideo. Relations were resumed in 1943 during the course of wartime cooperation.

Uruguay's trade with the Soviet bloc in recent years has accounted for 1 per cent of its exports and 5 per cent of its imports. Up to 1960, Latin American trade with the Soviet Union was concentrated mainly in Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Chile, and Uruguay, and accounted for a very small percentage of total world trade.[13]

The Communist Party of Uruguay is given a free hand, in keeping with the strong spirit of democratic freedom for which the country is famous. Uruguayan socialism and a relatively high standard of living, however, have not provided a proper atmosphere for real communist success, and membership in the Communist Party is estimated at less than 1 per cent.[14]

III. PARTICIPATION IN REGIONAL AND UNIVERSAL ORGANIZATIONS

Uruguayan interest in regional organizations was

---

[13]United States Congress, op. cit., p. 639.

[14]Ibid., p. 716.

country after WW I, succeeding representatives in 1926. Relations were severed in 1935, however, because of subversive activities of Russian legation officials in Montevideo. Relations were resumed in 1942 during the course of wartime cooperation.

Uruguay's trade with the Soviet Union in recent years has accounted for 1 per cent of its exports and 3 per cent of its imports. Up to 1950, Latin American trade with the Soviet Union was concentrated mainly in Argentina, Brazil, Cuba, Chile, and Uruguay, and accounted for a very small percentage of total world trade.[13]

The Communist Party of Uruguay is given a free hand, in keeping with the strong spirit of democratic freedom for which the country is famous. Uruguayan socialism and a relatively high standard of living, however, have not provided a proper atmosphere for real communist success, and membership in the Communist Party is estimated at less than 1 per cent.[14]

III. PARTICIPATION IN ECONOMIC AND UNIVERSAL ORGANIZATIONS

Uruguayan interest in regional organizations was

---

[13]United States Congress, OP. cit., p. 639.

[14]Ibid., p. 716.

voiced very succinctly in 1920 when President Baltasar Brum, in an address at the University of Montevideo, spoke of an "American league of nations." Being years ahead of his time, Brum proposed a league which would work in harmony with the League at Geneva and would have authority and responsibility over peculiarly-American problems, including defense of the American states. His proposals thus preceded by a quarter of a century the Rio Treaty of 1947, the Charter of the Organization of American States in 1948, and the relationship between the OAS and the United Nations.[15]

In the development of the inter-American system, Uruguay has played the role which might be expected of a small and militarily weak, yet democratic, state. Its foreign policy has always stressed the sovereignty and juridical equality of states, the peaceful arbitration of disputes, American solidarity and collective security, and the importance of observing international law. In the twentieth century, it has promoted democratic principles of government within its own country, has engaged in neither wars nor expansionism, has never been accused of breaking the principle of nonintervention, and has generally been on good terms with the nations of this hemisphere.

Typical of Uruguay's policy in the O.A.S. was the

---

[15]Fitzgibbon, op. cit., pp. 254-255.

[15] Whelpley, op. cit., pp. 234-235.

position taken by its delegation at the Ninth Meeting of Consultation in 1964 to consider Venezuela's charges against Cuba. The Uruguayan Foreign Minister, Alejandro Zorrilla de San Martín, stated that, in the opinion of his country, there had not taken place an "armed attack" by Cuba within the meaning of the Rio Treaty. In addition, he stated that the economic sanctions proposed by the O.A.S. would hurt the Cuban people, rather than their government, and would promote national action to consolidate, rather than weaken, the Cuban régime.[16] Nevertheless, Uruguay bowed to majority opinion and complied with the sanctions imposed under the Rio Treaty. In doing so, it had expressed its legal objections and moral reservations but did not shirk its obligation as a member nation of the regional body.

Uruguay's representatives have also taken an active part in the United Nations. In general, they have spoken with great moral authority on human rights and peaceful methods.[17] Believing firmly in the right of national self-determination, Uruguay was the prime mover in the Latin American bloc for the decisive support given to the

---

[16] OAS, op. cit., pp. 5-7.

[17] For a study of Uruguayan policy in the U.N., see Uruguayan Institute of International Law, Uruguay and the United Nations (New York: Manhattan Publishing Company, 1958).

[16] Cit., pp. 5-7.

[17] For a study of Uruguayan policy in the U.N., see Uruguay Institute of International Law, Uruguay and the United Nations (New York: Manhattan Publishing Company, 1956).

establishment of the state of Israel.[18] During discussions on the former Italian colony of Eritrea, the Uruguayan delegation again strongly backed that same principle. In 1946, expressing its strong aversion to dictators, Uruguay opposed the resumption of full diplomatic relations with Spain on the grounds that Franco's government was totalitarian in nature and had been established with the help of the Axis powers.[19]

In 1950, the Uruguayan delegation proposed that the definition of international aggression should be widened to include indirect aggression "such as the creation by any Power of subversive agencies in foreign countries with the object of undermining those countries' institutions."[20] In the same year, Uruguay supported the Uniting for Peace Resolution which strengthened the authority of the General Assembly in matters dealing with international security.

IV. CURRENT PROBLEMS IN FOREIGN POLICY FORMULATION

Problems currently affecting the formulation of foreign policy in Uruguay are mainly domestic in nature. The

---

[18] The New York Times, March 3, 1960.

[19] Pendle, op. cit., p. 78.

[20] Ibid.

---

[18] *The New York Times*, March 3, 1960.

[19] Kennis, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

[20] *Ibid.*

nine member National Council of Government has shown signs of political stagnation which, in turn, have prevented effective policy-making and implementation. In 1962, for example, concerning the position to be taken at the inter-American conference on Cuba, the Council split three ways when the six members of the Nationalist Party majority divided evenly on whether to adopt a "hard line" or a "soft line" toward the Castro régime, and the three members of the Colorado Party minority abstained in view of the majority split. Foreign Minister Homero Martínez Montero submitted his resignation because of this; but after the Council refused to accept it, he went to the conference without instructions and under orders to refer any majority decision to the Council.[21]

Considering the fact that the Nationalist Party won the election later that year by a margin of only 24,000 votes out of more than 1,000,000 votes cast, it is reasonable to expect that the leadership in the executive council will continue to find decision-making difficult because it lacks a popular mandate and has no majority in the Congress.[22] Political stagnation has, in turn, led to economic stagnation due to the inability to formulate effective programs to

---

[21] The New York Times, January 20, 1962.

[22] Ibid., June 16, 1963.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

combat inflation, to regain a favorable balance of trade, and to promote productivity.

Domestic policy, therefore, rather than foreign policy, is the major concern of the present Uruguayan administration. How effectively it deals with current political and economic problems will determine, to a large degree, the vigor and effectiveness of the foreign policy which it strives to pursue on the international scene.

coarse initiation. To topple a thorough defense of trade, and to promote prosperity.

Domestic policy, therefore, rather than foreign policy, is the major concern of the present Undersecretary administration. How effectively it deals with current political and economic problems will determine, to a large degree, the value and effectiveness of the foreign policy which he carries to pursue on the international scene.

CHAPTER IV

THE UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IN APRIL, 1965

On April 24, 1965, the civilian junta, headed by Donald Reid Cabral, was ousted by elements of the armed forces of the Dominican Republic. In view of the chaos that ensued and in order to protect American lives, President Johnson issued orders for the landing of American marines in Santo Domingo to facilitate the evacuation of U.S. nationals. This initial purpose of the U.S. intervention was soon expanded to include a certain political objective--the prevention of the establishment of another communist government in the Western Hemisphere.

I. THE DOMINICAN COUP D'ÉTAT

The coup d'état which occurred in Santo Domingo on April 24, 1965 placed in bold relief the serious problems which had plagued the small Caribbean republic since the assassination of strongman Rafael Leónidas Trujillo Molina in May, 1961. Trujillo's thirty-one-year dictatorship left in its wake a people untutored in constitutional government, an economy weakened by corruption, and a social structure in which the military and the wealthy predominated.

CHAPTER IX

THE UNITED STATES INTERVENTION IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IN APRIL, 1965

On April 24, 1965, the constitutional junta, headed by Donald Reid Cabral, was ousted by elements of the armed forces of the Dominican republic. In view of the chaos that ensued and in order to protect American lives, President Johnson issued orders for the landing of marines in Santo Domingo to facilitate the evacuation of U.S. nationals. This limited purpose of the U.S. intervention was soon expanded to include a certain political objective--the determination of the establishment of another communist government in the Western Hemisphere.

I. THE DOMINICAN COUP D'ÉTAT

The coup d'état which occurred in Santo Domingo on April 24, 1965 placed in bold relief the various problems which had plagued the small Caribbean republic since the assassination of Generalissimo Rafael Leónidas Trujillo Molina in May, 1961. Trujillo's thirty-one-year dictatorship left in its wake a people nurtured in constitutional government, an economy measured by corruption, and a social structure in which the military and the wealthy predominated.

In December, 1962, following eighteen months of rule by a seven-man civilian Council of State, Juan Bosch was elected president in the first free election in over thirty years.[1] By mid-1963, however, military commanders and conservative business forces became restless under the liberal-minded Bosch, claiming, among other things, that he was "soft on communism." When the military, under the leadership of Colonel Elías Wessin y Wessin, demanded that he pass a law outlawing the Communist Party, Bosch reacted by calling for Wessin y Wessin's resignation. The latter staged a bloodless coup in September that exiled Bosch to nearby Puerto Rico.

For the next eighteen months, the nation was ruled by a three-man civilian junta supported by the military. In December, 1963, Donald Reid Cabral, an auto dealer in Santo Domingo, moved up from his position as foreign minister to president of the junta. U.S. military and economic aid, which had been suspended after Bosch's ouster, was restored when Reid launched an austerity program and attempted to wipe out military graft and corruption.

Reid was more businessman than politician, however,

---

[1]Bosch, leader of the PRD (Partido Revolucionario Dominicano), was inaugurated on February 27, 1963, having received 60 per cent of the votes in an OAS-supervised election. The New York Times, April 25, 1965.

In December, 1962, following eighteen months of rule by a seven-man civilian Council of State, Juan Bosch was elected President in the first free election in over forty years.[1] By mid-1963, however, military conservatives and conservative business forces became restless under the liberal-minded Bosch, claiming, among other things, that he was "soft on communism." Even the military, under the leadership of Colonel Elías Wessin y Wessin, themselves rich as result of a law outlawing the Communist Party, began pushing for ousting Bosch in September that exiled Bosch to nearby Puerto Rico.

For the next eighteen months, the nation was ruled by a three-man civilian junta sponsored by the military. In December, 1963, Donald Reid Cabral, an auto dealer in Santo Domingo, moved up from his position as foreign minister to president of the junta. Like military and economic aid, which had been suspended after Bosch's ouster, was restored when Reid launched an austerity program and attempted to wipe out military graft and corruption.

Reid was more businessman than politician, however,

---

[1]Bosch, leader of the PRD (Partido Revolucionario Dominicano), was inaugurated on February 27, 1963, having received 60 per cent of the votes in an 80%-supervised election. The New York Times, April 25, 1963.

and he gradually alienated his bases of support. While trying to stabilize the nation's lagging economy, his policies antagonized business groups and labor leaders alike and resulted in heavy unemployment.[2] On the political scene, he announced that neither Juan Bosch nor Joaquín Balaguer[3] would be allowed to run as candidates in elections to be held in September, 1965; at the same time, however, he hinted that he himself might campaign for the Presidency. Bosch and Balaguer supporters were visibly antagonized.

Finally, Reid lost his primary base of support--the military. In an effort to end corruption, he initiated a reform program which was intended to stop smuggling and other questionable commercial activities in which some senior military officers were engaged. In addition, he removed a number of senior military officers from key positions and tried to bring the armed forces under civil rule.[4] Junior officers, meanwhile, felt that the military reforms were not broad enough and were being executed too slowly.

---

[2]At the time of the coup, it was estimated that one-third of the nation's labor force was unemployed. Visión, May 14, 1965, p. 12.

[3]Balaguer, as the last president under Trujillo, headed a Council of State which ruled the nation during the transition period following Trujillo's assassination. In January, 1962, he was exiled to New York, where he organized the Partido Reformista, ibid., June 12, 1964, p. 19.

[4]Ibid., May 14, 1965, pp. 12-13.

Out of this precarious economic and political situation arose the revolution which began on Saturday, April 24, 1965.[5] Although reports of the exact sequence of events in the first few hours of the revolution were somewhat at variance, it seems clear to state that the movement started as a coup by young officers who wished to return Bosch to the Presidency, but that by the following morning various political groupings in Santo Domingo had joined the rebellion to pursue their individual objectives. On April 25, Reid resigned and went into hiding, having failed to retain the support of the Dominican military commanders.

What began as a military coup quickly assumed the proportions of a popular uprising. Those in favor of returning Bosch to the Presidency included civilian members of the PRD, supported by young officers and non-commissioned officers of the Dominican army. Anti-Bosch forces consisted of most of the senior military officers, as well as those units of the armed forces which they were able to control. Radio stations in Santo Domingo were used by opposing factions to rally the support of the civilian population.

On Sunday afternoon, Rafael Molina Ureña, a leading

---

[5]U.S. Ambassador William Tapley Bennett left Santo Domingo on April 23 for consultations in Washington. Also absent on the day of the coup were eleven of the thirteen officers of the U.S. Military Assistance and Advisory Mission, who were attending a conference in Panama, The Washington Post, June 27, 1965.

[illegible] out of [illegible] economic and political alliance-
tion across the revolution which began on Saturday, April 24,
1965.[2] Although reports of the exact sequence of events in
the first few hours of the revolution were somewhat de vari-
ance, it seems clear to state that the movements started as a
coup by young officers who aimed to restore Goulart to the
presidency, but then by the following morning various politi-
cal groupings in Rio de Janeiro had joined the rebellion to
pursue their individual objectives. On April 25, Goulart
realized and went into hiding, having failed to retain the
support of the Brazilian military commanders.

What began as a military coup quickly assumed the
proportions of a popular uprising. Thus, in favor of re-
turning power to the Brazilian civilian regime of
the PRD, supported by young officers and non-commissioned
officers of the Brazilian army. Anti-Reich forces consisted
of most of the senior military officers, as well as those
units of the armed forces which they were able to control.
Radio stations in Rio de Janeiro were used by opposing fac-
tions to rally the support of the civilian population.

On Sunday afternoon, April 25th, a leading

---

[2] U.S. Ambassador William Tapley Bennett left Rio de
Janeiro on April 23 for consultations in Washington. Also
absent on the day of the coup were eleven of the thirteen
officers of the U.S. Military Assistance and Advisory Mis-
sion, who were attending a conference in Panama, The
Washington Post, June 27, 1965.

figure in the PRD, was installed by the rebel movement as provisional president pending Bosch's return from Puerto Rico. Fearing that they might have to face the bulk of the nation's military, the rebels distributed arms to the civilians in Ciudad Nueva, the rebel-controlled sector of Santo Domingo.

After the installation of Molina Ureña, Wessin sought out the support of the navy, while the head of the air force directed air attacks upon the rebel-held National Palace. Alleging pro-communist sympathy on the part of Bosch, Wessin saw in the rebel movement the threat of a communist takeover and called for support in his fight against communism.[6]

By April 27, the air force, navy, and most of the army had aligned themselves on the anti-rebel side, and the threat of an all-out attack upon the rebel area of the capital seemed imminent. Fearing their position to be hopeless in the face of such odds, Molina Ureña and some of his advisors went to the U.S. Embassy to seek Ambassador Bennett's intercession in arranging a settlement. When their attempts failed, however, Molina Ureña sought asylum in the Colombian Embassy while other leaders of the PRD fled to various other Latin American embassies. At this juncture, the rebel movement seemed doomed.

---

[6]The Christian Science Monitor, April 29, 1965.

figure in the OAS, was heralded by the rebel movement as provisional president pending hoped-for return from Puerto Rico. Fearing that they might have to face the bulk of the nation's military, the rebels distributed arms to the civilians in Ciudad Nueva; the rebel-controlled sector of Santo Domingo.

Across the barricades of boiling cross, wealth sought out the support of the navy, while the head of the air force directed all attacks upon the rebel-held National Palace. Alleging pro-Communist sympathy on the part of Bosch, nearly one in the rebel movement the threat of a Communist takeover and called the support in his fight against Communism.[6]

By April 27, the air force, navy, and most of the army had aligned themselves on the anti-rebel side, and the threat of an all-out effort upon the rebel area of the capital seemed imminent. Fearing their position to be hopeless in the face of such odds, Molina Urena and some of his advisory went to the O.A.S. embassy to seek Ambassador Bunker's intervention in arranging a settlement. When their attempts failed, however, Molina Urena sought asylum in the Colombian Embassy with other leaders of the PRD fled to various other Latin American embassies. At this juncture, the rebel movement seized power.

---

[6]The Christian Science Monitor, April 29, 1965.

The collapse of rebel leadership was only momentary, however, and on the following day--April 28--Colonel Francisco Caamaño Deñó emerged as head of the movement, which now contained significant numbers of armed civilians. The superior military position which Wessin earlier enjoyed was reversed that afternoon when a tank-led attack upon Santo Domingo was repelled by rebel forces.

By the afternoon of April 28, the situation in Santo Domingo was one of confusion and anarchy. With politically-immature rebel military officers outnumbered by armed civilians, it was alleged that leadership of the movement was passing into the hands of communists.[7] Wessin, meanwhile, had formed a three-man military junta headed by Air Force Colonel Pedro Bartolomé Benoit to act as provisional government. Complete coordination and control of the junta military forces had not yet been achieved, however, and Wessin's efforts to smash the rebel movement during the 28th were unsuccessful.

By late afternoon, the breakdown of law and order appeared complete. Armed mobs terrorized the city, firing indiscriminately on homes and other buildings, including the United States and other embassies. Anti-rebel military and police authorities informed the American Embassy that they

---

[7] Ibid., May 1, 1965.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, May 1, 1968.

were no longer able to guarantee the safety of American lives.[8]

II. INTERVENTION ON HUMANITARIAN GROUNDS

On April 24, after receiving the first news of the revolt, President Johnson ordered a U.S. Navy task group to the vicinity of the Dominican Republic as a "routine precautionary move."[9] On the following day, Americans in the Santo Domingo area were advised by embassy officials to prepare for evacuation. Those who desired to leave began to assemble at the Hotel Embajador on the 26th. The evacuation commenced on the following day, and by nightfall 1,172 persons of American and other nationalities departed by ship and helicopter.[10]

---

[8]"On April 28 . . . the colonel [Benoit] sent another note to Ambassador Bennett which read: 'Regarding my earlier request, I wish to add that American lives are in danger and conditions of public disorder make it impossible to provide adequate protection. I therefore ask you for temporary intervention and assistance in restoring order in this country.'" The New York Times, May 7, 1965.

[9]Led by the amphibious assault ship Boxer, which carried a reinforced Marine battalion of 1,500 men, the task group was in the Caribbean on a training cruise at the time of its re-assignment. The State Department emphasized that "there was no intention of using the 1500-man Marine battalion aboard the Boxer to 'intervene' in the Dominican political situation," ibid., April 27, 1965.

[10]Ibid., April 28, 1965.

were no longer able to guarantee the safety of American lives.[9]

II. INTERVENTION ON HUMANITARIAN GROUNDS

On April 24, after receiving the first news of the revolt, President Johnson ordered a U.S. Navy task group to the vicinity of the Dominican Republic as a "routine precautionary move."[9] On the following day, Americans in the Santo Domingo area were advised by embassy officials to prepare for evacuation. Those who wanted to leave began to assemble at the Hotel Embajador on the 28th. The evacuation commenced on the following day, and by nightfall 1,172 persons of American and other nationalities departed by air and helicopter.[10]

---

[8]On April 28 . . . the colonel [Benoit] sent another note to Ambassador Bennett which read: "Regarding my earlier request, I wish to add that American lives are in danger and conditions of public disorder make it impossible to provide adequate protection. I therefore ask you for temporary intervention and assistance in restoring order in this country." The New York Times, May 7, 1965.

[9]Led by the amphibious assault ship Boxer, which carried a reinforced marine battalion of 1,500 men, the task group was in the Caribbean on a training cruise at the time of its re-assignment. The State Department emphasized that "there was no intention of using the 1500-man Marine battalion aboard the Boxer to 'intervene' in the Dominican political situation," Ibid., April 27, 1965.

[10]Ibid., April 28, 1965.

On April 28, Ambassador Bennett, who had returned to Santo Domingo on the preceding day, viewed with apprehension the armed revolt in the capital and feared that the continuing evacuation of Americans was in danger. By late afternoon, having been advised that protection of American lives could no longer be assured, Bennett cabled Washington and urged the immediate landing of U.S. troops.[11] At 6:30 p.m., President Johnson's authorization was received by the U.S.S. Boxer, and the landing of four hundred Marines commenced immediately.

In a nationwide radio-television broadcast later that evening, the President said:

> The United States Government has been informed by military authorities in the Dominican Republic that American lives are in danger. These authorities are no longer able to guarantee their safety, and they have reported that the assistance of military personnel is now needed for that purpose.
>
> I have ordered the Secretary of Defense to put the necessary American troops ashore in order to give protection to hundreds of Americans who are still in the Dominican Republic and to escort them safely back to this country. This same assistance will be

---

[11]President Johnson, meeting with Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara, received the cable at 5:14 p.m. As the President later stated, "Ambassador Bennett . . . went on in that cable to say that only an immediate landing of American forces could safeguard and protect the lives of thousands of Americans and thousands of other citizens of some 30 other countries. Ambassador Bennett urged your President to order an immediate landing." U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1351, May 17, 1965, pp. 744-745.

On April 25, Ambassador Bennett, who had returned to Santo Domingo on the preceding day, viewed with apprehension the armed revolt in the capital and feared that the continuing evacuation of Americans was in danger. By late afternoon, having been advised that protection of American lives could no longer be assured, Bennett cabled Washington and urged the immediate landing of U.S. troops.[1] At 8:30 p.m., President Johnson's authorization was received by the U.S.S. Boxer, and the landing of four hundred Marines commenced immediately.

In a nationwide radio-television broadcast later that evening, the President said:

> The United States Government has been informed by military authorities in the Dominican Republic that American lives are in danger. These authorities are no longer able to guarantee their safety, and they have reported that the assistance of military personnel is now needed for that purpose.
>
> I have ordered the Secretary of Defense to put the necessary American troops ashore in order to give protection to hundreds of Americans who are still in the Dominican Republic and to escort them safely back to this country. This same assistance will be

---

[1] President Johnson, meeting with Secretary of State Rusk and Secretary of Defense McNamara, received the cable at 5:14 p.m. As the President later stated, "Ambassador Bennett . . . went on in that cable to say that only an immediate landing of American forces could safeguard and protect the lives of thousands of Americans and thousands of other citizens of some 30 other countries. Ambassador Bennett urged your President to order an immediate landing." U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LIX, No. 1531, May 17, 1965, pp. 714-715.

available to the nationals of other countries, some of whom have already asked for our help.[12]

On the following day, additional forces were landed, including two battalions of the 82nd Airborne Division from Fort Bragg. By May 5th, 3,270 persons had been evacuated,[13] while the number of U.S. troops had risen to 19,000. By this time, however, humanitarian considerations had assumed secondary importance to the intervention's political implications.

III. INTERVENTION ON POLITICAL GROUNDS: THE SO-CALLED JOHNSON DOCTRINE

From April 28 until May 2, the Johnson Administration publicly justified the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic on purely humanitarian grounds. Outside the Administration, however, a political motivation for the U.S. action was being mentioned within less than forty-eight hours after the first Marine landing.

On April 30, the New York Times stated that "through a combination of hemispheric diplomacy and a military show of force, the Administration was hoping to bring about a cease-fire and prevent a Communist takeover." In the same

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 738-739.

[13] This number consisted of 1,897 Americans and 1,373 nationals from 41 other countries, The New York Times, May 6, 1965.

available to the nationals of other countries, some of whom have already rushed for our help.[12]

On the following day, additional forces were landed, including two battalions of the 82nd Airborne Division from Fort Bragg. By May 5th, 3,270 persons had been evacuated,[13] while the number of U.S. troops had risen to 19,000. By this time, however, humanitarian considerations had assumed secondary importance to the intervention's political implications.

III. INTERVENTION OR POLITICAL CROSSROADS: THE 82-CABLE DOMINICAN DOCUMENTS

From April 28 until May 2, the Johnson Administration publicly justified the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic on purely humanitarian grounds. Outside the Administration, however, a political motivation for the U.S. action was being mentioned within less than forty-eight hours after the first Marine landing.

On April 30, the New York Times stated that "through a combination of peacepheric diplomacy and a military show of force, the Administration was hoping to bring about a cease-fire and prevent a Communist takeover." In the same

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 738-739.

[13] This number consisted of 1,897 Americans and 1,373 nationals from 41 other countries. The New York Times, May 6, 1965.

edition, Tad Szulc reported from Santo Domingo that "a high-ranking United States Navy officer declared that the function of the Marines was not only to protect the continuing evacuation but also 'to see that no Communist government is established in the Dominican Republic.'" Szulc went on to say that the Marines "would support the forces of the Dominican military junta in their attempts to smash a Communist-infiltrated revolt."

An official hint concerning possible communist infiltration of the rebel movement was voiced on the evening of April 30, when President Johnson stated that "there are signs that people trained outside the Dominican Republic are seeking to gain control."[14] On May 2, in a nationwide radio-television broadcast, the President spoke in more specific terms:

> The revolutionary movement took a tragic turn. Communist leaders, many of them trained in Cuba . . . joined the revolution. They took increasing control. And what began as a popular democratic revolution,

---

[14] U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1351, May 17, 1965, p. 742. A day earlier, however, U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker told the OAS ambassadors that "the Embassy reported that the leadership of the rebellious forces had very clearly fallen into hands of extreme left-wing Castro-communist leaders, with some few army officers who were cooperating. Responsible supporters of Mr. Bosch and the leaders of his political party had abandoned the struggle and signified their desire for a cease-fire." OAS, Acta de la sesión del consejo de la OEA celebrada el 29 de Abril de 1965 (OEA/Ser G/II, C-a-569 [Provisional], Part I), p. 3.

[illegible] Dominican [illegible] Santo Domingo that "a Marxist-
running Junior Junta Navy officer declared that the Constitu-
tion of the Republic was not only to protect the continuing
evacuation but also [illegible] be communist penetrance is
established in the Dominican Republic." Stated next on to
say that the Marines "would support the forces of the
Dominican military junta in their attempts to wreck a
Communist-inflicted revolt."

An editorial also commented [illegible] communist infil-
tration of the rebel movement was raised on the evening of
April 30, when President Johnson stated that "there are
signs that people trained outside the Dominican Republic are
seeking to gain control."[14] On May 3, in a nationwide
radio-television broadcast, the President spoke in more
specific terms:

> The revolutionary movement took a tragic turn.
> Communist leaders, many of them trained in Cuba [illegible]
> seized the revolution. They took increasing control.
> And what began as a popular democratic revolution,

---

[14] U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1332, May 17, 1965, p. 715. "A day earlier, however, U.S. Ambassador Elsworth Bunker told the OAS ambassadors that the Embassy suspected that the leadership of the rebellious forces had very closely fallen into hands of extreme left-wing Castro-Communist leaders," with some few army officers who were cooperating. Responsible supporters of Mr. Bosch and the leaders of his political party had abandoned the struggle and disarmed their deputy for a cease-fire." OAS, Acta de la sesión del comercio de la OEA celebrada el 29 de Abril de 1965 (Washington, D.C., [illegible]), p. 2.

> committed to democracy and social justice, very shortly moved and was taken over and really seized and placed into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere. [Italics not in the original]. This was the unanimous view of all the American nations when, in January 1962, they declared, and I quote: "The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the Inter-American system."[15]

The italicized portion of the above Presidential statement was quickly labeled the "Johnson Doctrine"[16] and dispelled any doubts that may have still existed concerning the purpose of the U.S. intervention. In addition to the original humanitarian justification for the U.S. action, its political motivation was now defined in unmistakable terms, and subsequent American military and diplomatic moves were directed toward that end. On May 9, the total number of U.S. forces either on the island or aboard ship off Santo

---

[15] U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1351, May 17, 1965, pp. 745-746.

[16] Addressing the U.N. Security Council on May 4, Ambassador Carlos María Velásquez of Uruguay apparently was the first to use the term "Johnson Doctrine," arguing that it was a unilateral political statement rather than a legal doctrine, infra, pp. 76-77. The term made its first appearance in The New York Times on May 5 in separate articles authored by James Reston and C. L. Sulzberger. On May 6, an editorial in The New York Times stated that "the Johnson Doctrine means that the emphasis is now going to be on resisting the advance of communism anywhere in the world with military force . . . ."

> commitment to democracy and social justice: very shortly moved and was taken over and really seized and placed into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators.
>
> . . . .
>
> The American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere. (Italics not in the original). This was the unanimous view of all the American nations when, in January 1962, they declared, and I quote: "The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system."[15]

The italicized portion of the above Presidential statement was quickly labeled the "Johnson Doctrine"[16] and dispelled any doubts that may have still existed concerning the purpose of the U.S. intervention. In addition to the original humanitarian justification for the U.S. action, its political motivation was now defined in unmistakable terms, and subsequent American military and diplomatic moves were directed toward that end. On May 9, the total number of U.S. forces ashore on the island or enroute was [illegible]

---

[15] U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1351, May 17, 1965, pp. 745-746.

[16] Addressing the U.N. Security Council on May 4, Ambassador Carlos Maria Velázquez of Uruguay apparently was the first to use the term "Johnson Doctrine," arguing that it was a unilateral political statement rather than a legal doctrine. Ibid., pp. 76-77. The term made its first appearance in the New York Times on May 5 in separate articles authored by James Reston and C. L. Sulzberger. On May 9, an editorial in the New York Times stated that "the Johnson Doctrine means that the emphasis is now going to be on resisting the advance of communism anywhere in the world with military force . . . ."

Domingo had increased to 30,522.[17] At the San Isidro air base, meanwhile, activity mounted daily as 296 U.S. aircraft, operating from bases in 11 states, ferried in troops and supplies.[18] The magnitude of the U.S. commitment gave clear evidence of its purpose, for such a large number of troops apparently went beyond that required to effect an evacuation. Also, the deployment of the U.S. forces in Santo Domingo indicated to some observers Washington's alignment with the military junta in the latter's efforts to crush the rebel movement.[19]

During this time, further attempts were made by various Administration officials to explain the U.S. intervention. When it was charged that the U.S. had acted without either consulting or advising the OAS,[20] President Johnson said:

> There may be those in our own country who say that such action was good but we should have waited, or we should have delayed, or we should have consulted further, or we should have called a meeting. But from the very beginning, the United States, at my instructions, had worked for a cease-fire beginning the Saturday the revolution took place. The matter was

---

[17] The New York Times, May 9, 1965.

[18] Ibid., May 7, 1965.

[19] Ibid., May 2, 1965. See also Tad Szulc, "When the Marines Stormed Ashore in Santo Domingo," The Saturday Evening Post, July 31, 1965, pp. 36-46.

[20] The New York Times, May 2, 1965.

Dominga had increased to 30,522.[17] At the San Isidro air base, reportedly, activity mounted daily as 270 U.S. aircraft, operating from bases in 11 states, started to scope and supplies.[18] The magnitude of the U.S. commitment gave clear evidence of its purpose, for such a large number of troops apparently went beyond that required to effect an evacuation. Also, the deployment of the U.S. forces in Santo Domingo indicated to some observers Washington's alignment with the military junta in the latter's efforts to crush rebel government.[19]

During this time, further attempts were made by Ventura Administration officials to explain the U.S. intervention. When it was charged that the U.S. had acted without either consulting or advising the OAS,[20] President Johnson said:

> There may be those in our own country who say that such action was good but we should have waited, or we should have delayed, or we should have consulted further, or we should have called a meeting. But from the very beginning, the United States, as my instructions, had worked for a cease-fire beginning the Saturday the revolution took place. The matter was

---

[17] The New York Times, May 9, 1965.

[18] Ibid., May 7, 1965.

[19] Ibid., May 2, 1965. See also Tad Szulc, "When the Marines Stormed Across to Santo Domingo," The Saturday Evening Post, July 31, 1965, pp. 16-26.

[20] The New York Times, May 2, 1965.

> before the OAS Peace Committee on Tuesday, at our suggestion. It was before the full Council on Wednesday, and when I made my announcement to the American people that evening, I announced then I was notifying the Council . . . there was no time to talk, to consult, or to delay . . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Our goal is a simple one. We are there to save the lives of our citizens and to save the lives of all people. Our goal, in keeping with the great principles of the inter-American system, is to help prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere . . . .[21]

During a press interview several days later, Secretary of State Dean Rusk explained:

> The first action taken by the United States was indeed a rescue operation . . . after the initial emergency, United States forces were necessary to preserve the situation in the Dominican Republic until the OAS could take charge. Meanwhile the evidence was mounting that the Communists had captured the revolution according to plan, and the danger of a Communist takeover was established beyond question.[22]

At a special meeting of the OAS Council on April 29, Ambassador Bunker stated:

> The United States must . . . reserve its right to take the necessary measures to protect its own citizens and officials from violence in a situation of anarchy.
>
> There are many precedents for this kind of situation. None of this is inconsistent with the

---

[21] U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1351, May 17, 1965, pp. 745-747.

[22] Ibid., Vol. LII, No. 1353, May 31, 1965, p. 842.

before the Old Peace Committee on Tuesday, at our suggestion. It was before the full Council on Wednesday, and when I made my announcement to the American people that evening, I announced then I was notifying the Council . . . there was no time to talk, to consult, or to delay . . . .

. . . . . .

Our goal is a simple one. We are there to save the lives of our citizens and to save the lives of all people. Our goal, in keeping with the great principles of the Inter-American System, is to help prevent another Communist state in this hemisphere . . . .[21]

During a press interview several days later, Secretary of State Dyer was explained:

The first action taken by the United States was indeed a rescue operation . . . after the initial emergency, United States forces were necessary to preserve the situation in the Dominican Republic until the OAS could take charge. Meanwhile the evidence was mounting that the Communists had captured the revolution according to plan, and the danger of a Communist takeover was established beyond question.[22]

At a special meeting of the OAS Council on April 28, Ambassador Dwyer stated:

The United States must . . . reserve its right to take the necessary measures to protect its own citizens and officials from violence in a situation of anarchy.

There are many precedents for this kind of situation. None of this is inconsistent with the

---

[21] U.S., Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1353, May 17, 1965, pp. 745-747.

[22] Ibid., Vol. LII, No. 1353, May 31, 1965, p. 842.

> inter-American obligations. We wholeheartedly subscribe to these obligations, including the doctrine of nonintervention and self-determination.
>
> We are not talking about intruding in the domestic affairs of other countries; we are talking simply about the elementary duty to save lives . . . .[23]

On May 5, U.S. Representative Adlai Stevenson said in the United Nations Security Council:

> The United States action in the Dominican Republic was emergency action taken to protect lives [italics in the original] and to give the inter-American system a chance to deal with a situation within its competence.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In this case--when hours and even minutes counted--there was no time for deliberate consultation and for the organization of international machinery which did not yet exist.[24]

Addressing a University of Toronto convocation later that month, Stevenson added that "until the international community is ready to rescue its victims, there is no alternative but national power to fill the peace-keeping vacuum."[25]

Depending upon the analyst's point of view, the implications drawn from these statements were varied. For realists versed in the tradition of power politics and

---

[23]OAS, Acta de la sesión del consejo de la OEA celebrada el 29 de Abril de 1965, op. cit., Part II, p. 34.

[24]U.S. Department of State Bulletin, Vol. LII, No. 1353, May 31, 1965, p. 877.

[25]The New York Times, May 29, 1965.

[illegible]

In the United Nations Security Council

[illegible]

[illegible]

In this case—when power and even minutes counted—there was no time for deliberate communication and for the organization of international machinery which did not yet exist.[23]

Addressing a University of Toronto convocation later that month, Pearson noted that "until the international community is ready to rescue its victims, there is no alternative but for national power to fill the peace-keeping vacuum."[24]

Depending upon the analyst's point of view, the implications [illegible] realities versed in the tradition of power politics and

---

[23] Ibid. Acres de la sesión del consejo de la ONU celebrada el 13 de abril de 1960, op. cit., pars. 111, p. 36.

[24] U.S., Department of State Bulletin, Vol. XLI, No. 1049, (May 16, 1960), p. 817.

[25] The New York Times, May 29, 1960.

spheres of influence, the United States had apparently acted out of both domestic and foreign policy considerations in trying to prevent the debacle of "another Cuba." For legalists whose primary frame of reference is the conduct of international relations in accordance with existing contractual obligations, the U.S. action was deemed a violation of the charters of the OAS and the UN. Many, however, while recognizing the realistic as well as the legalistic implications of the U.S. intervention, were more concerned over the possible effect which it might have upon determining the direction of the movement for social change in progress throughout Latin America. They voiced the fear that U.S. policy toward the Dominican revolution might raise a question about the sincerity of the United States expressed concern for social reform and might frustrate the hopes of the democratic Left, thereby causing them to accept support from communist elements in their efforts to promote social change.

CHAPTER V

THE URUGUAYAN POSITION IN THE O.A.S.

The U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic raised fundamental issues for the inter-American system, not only relative to the outcome of the Dominican crisis itself but also in respect to the continuing effectiveness of the regional system. Opposition to the policy adopted by the United States in the Dominican crisis was strongest among Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Peru. Uruguay, in particular, voiced strong disagreement with both the U.S. intervention and the course which the O.A.S. followed during the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. Consistent with its juridical approach to the conduct of international relations, Uruguayan diplomats repeatedly stressed the contractual obligations imposed upon member states by the O.A.S. Charter and urged that proposed measures strictly conform to the juridical principles contained in the Charter and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

I. OPPOSITION TO THE CONVOCATION OF THE TENTH MEETING OF CONSULTATION

At a secret session of the OAS Council on the morning of April 29, which was convened at the request of the United

CHAPTER V

THE GUATEMALAN REVOLUTION IN THE U.N.'S

The U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic raised fundamental issues for the Inter-American system, not only relative to the outcome of the Dominican crisis itself but also in regard to the continuing effectiveness of the regional system. Opposition to the policy adopted by the United States in the Dominican crisis was strongest among Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Peru. Generally, it paralleled, veiled strong disapproval with both the U.S. intervention and the course taken by the O.A.S. Following heated Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, convened with its juridical approach to the doctrine of intervention, Uruguayan diplomats repeatedly attacked the doctrinal objectives imposed upon member states by the O.A.S. Treaties and urged that proposed measures reflect closer adherence to the juridical principles contained in the Charter and the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

1. OPPOSITION TO THE CONVOCATION OF THE TENTH MEETING OF CONSULTATION

It a hastily session of the OAS Council on the morning of April 27, which was convened at the request of the United

States, U.S. Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker reported on the action taken by his government on the preceding evening and told of the developments in the Dominican Republic which led to that action. Citing the breakdown of law and order in Santo Domingo, he explained the necessity of sending in U.S. forces in order to insure the safe evacuation of U.S. and other foreign nationals. Also, he mentioned the involvement of Castro-communist leaders in the rebel movement.[1]

Bunker's statement was followed by that of the Dominican Ambassador, José Antonio Bonilla Atiles, which described the situation in Santo Domingo as a struggle against communism rather than a contest between political parties. Comparing the Dominican rebellion to the Castro revolution in Cuba, he warned that "the problem is not a Dominican problem; the problem concerns all of us . . . ."[2]

After the approval of a Colombian resolution which requested that the Council direct an urgent appeal for a cease-fire, the delegate from Venezuela informed the assembled ambassadors that his government intended to introduce a resolution calling for a meeting of the Organ of Consultation

---

[1]OAS, Acta de la sesión del consejo de la organización de los Estados Americanos celebrada el 29 de Abril de 1965 (Washington, 1965), OEA/Ser G/II, Document C-a-569, Part I [provisional], April 29, 1965, pp. 2-5.

[2]Ibid., pp. 7-14.

[illegible] p. 14.

under Article 6 of the Rio Treaty[3] to consider the grave situation in the Dominican Republic. In the lengthy discussion which followed, some of the delegations favored adopting the Venezuelan proposal, while others suggested the desirability of convoking a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs in accordance with Article 39 of the OAS Charter.[4]

After recessing to enable delegates to contact their governments, the meeting of the Council was resumed that evening in open session. Two resolutions were introduced at that time--one by Venezuela calling for a meeting of the Organ of Consultation; the other by Chile requesting a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. One by one, the various delegates expressed their governments' views.

---

[3] Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty), Article 6: "If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Continent."

[4] OAS Charter, Article 39: "The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs shall be held in order to consider problems of an urgent nature and of common interest to the American States, and to serve as the Organ of Consultation."

under Article 6 of the Rio Treaty[3] to consider the grave situation in the Dominican Republic. In the lengthy discussion which followed, some of the delegations favored adopting the Venezuelan proposal, while others supported the desirability of convening a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs in accordance with Article 39 of the OAS Charter.[4]

After recessing to enable delegates to consult their governments, the meeting of the Council was resumed that evening in open session. Two resolutions were introduced at that time--one by Venezuela calling for a meeting of the Organ of Consultation; the other by Chile requesting a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. One by one, the various delegates expressed their governments' views.

---

[3] Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Treaty), Article 6: "If the invulnerability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American State should be affected by an aggression which is not an armed attack or by an extra-continental or intra-continental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the Organ of Consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the Continent."

[4] OAS Charter, Article 39: "The Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs shall be held in order to consider problems of an urgent nature and of common interest to the American States, and to serve as the Organ of Consultation."

In accordance with instructions received from the Uruguayan National Council of Government, Ambassador Emilio N. Oribe stated that he would vote against the proposal to convoke a Meeting of Consultation, since his government considered that the object of such a meeting would be a matter "exclusively under the internal jurisdiction of the Dominican Republic." According to the information possessed by the Uruguayan executive council, the Dominican crisis had not as yet endangered the peace and security of the American States. Oribe further emphasized his nation's "displeasure toward every type of intervention which is not authorized by existing international agreements" and urged the Council to conform its actions in strict accordance with international law and the juridical procedures sanctioned by the inter-American system.[5]

After considerable deliberation, a vote was taken which approved the Chilean resolution, and the opening of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation was scheduled to commence on May 1.[6]

---

[5] OAS, Acta de la sesión del Consejo de la Organización de los Estados Americanos. Reanudación de la Sesión Ordinaria Celebrada el 29 de Abril de 1965 (Washington, 1965) OEA/Ser G/II, Doc. C-a-569 [provisional], Part II, April 29, 1965, pp. 19-20.

[6] The vote was 18-1 (Uruguay), with one abstention (Dominican Republic). Cuba, of course, is presently excluded from participation in the OAS. For the text of Chile's resolution, see Appendix A.

In accordance with instructions received from the Uruguayan National Council of Government, Ambassador Emilio N. Oribe stated that he would vote against the proposal to convoke a meeting of consultation, since his government considered that the object of such a meeting would be a matter "exclusively under the internal jurisdiction of the Dominican Republic." According to the information obtained by the Uruguayan executive council, the Dominican crisis had not as yet endangered the peace and security of the American States. Oribe further expressed his nation's "displeasure toward every type of intervention which is not authorized by existing international agreements" and urged the Council to conform its actions in strict accordance with international law and the juridical procedures sanctioned by the Inter-American system.[5]

After considerable deliberation, a vote was taken which approved the Chilean resolution, and the opening of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation was scheduled to commence on May 1.[6]

---

[5] OAS, Acta de la sesión del Consejo de la Organización de los Estados Americanos. Convocatoria de la sesión celebrada el 29 de abril de 1965 (Washington, 1965), OEA/Ser.G/II, Doc. C-a-563 (provisional), Part II, April 29, 1965, pp. 15-20.

[6] The vote was 19-1 (Uruguay), with one abstention (Dominican Republic). Cuba, of course, is presently excluded from participation in the OAS. For the text of Chile's resolution, see Appendix A.

Bunker then proposed that the Council reiterate its appeal for a cease-fire and that it request that an international neutral zone of refuge be established in Santo Domingo surrounding the embassies of foreign governments. Because of humanitarian considerations, there was general approval for this resolution;[7] Uruguay, however, abstained from giving its approval. Cribe argued that the Council was exceeding its authority in passing a resolution which, in his interpretation, was of a political nature and thus not within the competence of the Council. Had Article 6 of the Rio Treaty been invoked instead of Article 39 of the Charter, he reasoned, the Council would have been empowered immediately to constitute itself as provisional Organ of Consultation and adopt measures necessary to deal with the Dominican crisis. Under the circumstances, he concluded, further action should await the opening session of the Meeting of Consultation on the following day.[8]

II. DISAPPROVAL OF THE U.S. INTERVENTION

The opening plenary session of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation commenced on May 1 under the presidency of the Nicaraguan Ambassador, Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa. As was

---

[7]For text of the resolution, see Appendix B.

[8]OAS, op. cit., Part II, pp. 43-45.

Hunter then proposed that the Council reiterate its appeal for a cease-fire and that it request that an international neutral zone of refuge be established in Santo Domingo surrounding the embassies of foreign governments. Because of Dominican constitutional considerations, there was unanimous approval for this resolution.[7] Bowman, sensing from Hyde quite approved. Uribe argued that the country was economically its authority to penalize a resolution which, in his interpretation, was of a political nature and thus not within the competence of the Council. Had Article 39 of the Rio Treaty been invoked instead of Article 34 of the Charter, he reasoned, the Council would have empowered immediately to consider itself as provisional Organ of Consultation and adopt measures necessary to deal with the emergency. Under the circumstances, he concluded, further action should await the opening session of the Meeting of Consultation on the following day.[8]

II. DISAPPROVAL OF THE U.S. INTERVENTION

The opening plenary session of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation commenced on May 1 under the presidency of Ricardo Luna Penaranda. Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa, as was

---

[7]For text of the resolution, see Appendix B.

[8]Hyde, op. cit., Part 12, pp. 43-47.

expected, the statements made by many of the Latin American delegations reflected a strong opposition to the unilateral U.S. intervention, as well as their reaffirmation of the juridical principles of the inter-American system. Although recognizing the gravity of the situation which the OAS was facing, they were in general agreement on the desirability of pursuing only such a course which would fall within the framework of the contractual procedures sanctioned by the OAS and which would strengthen the image of the regional system in the eyes of the international community. Although Mr. Bunker again justified the U.S. action on purely humanitarian grounds,[9] Latin American criticism focused upon U.S. violation of the provisions of the Charter prohibiting unilateral intervention.[10] Foremost among the critics were Chile, Mexico, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Peru.

---

[9] OAS, Décima Reunión de Consulta de Ministros de Relaciones Exteriores (Washington: Pan American Union, 1965), Document 14 (rev.), May 28, 1965, p. 8. [Hereafter cited as Décima Reunión de Consulta.]

[10] OAS Charter, Article 15: "No State or group of States has the right to intervene, directly or indirectly, for any reason whatever, in the internal or external affairs of any other State. The foregoing principle prohibits not only armed force but also any other form of interference or attempted threat against the personality of the State or against its political, economic and cultural elements"; Article 17: "The territory of a State is inviolable; it may not be the object, even temporarily, of military occupation or of other measures of force taken by another State, directly or indirectly, on any grounds whatever. No territorial acquisitions or special advantages obtained either by force or by other means of coercion shall be recognized."

Ruben A. Chelle, representing Uruguay in the temporary absence of Ambassador Oribe, followed his government's instructions to "reject energetically . . . every type of intervention, direct or indirect, in the internal affairs of an American nation in violation of Articles expressed in the OAS Charter . . . ." In the view of his government, he emphasized, the topic of the Meeting of Consultation "should be interpreted . . . as referring principally to the grave armed situation created by the landing of forces . . . of an American nation upon the territory of the Dominican Republic."[11] Later that day, during discussions concerning the sending of an investigating committee to Santo Domingo, Chelle indicated Uruguay's support for the measure, with the reservation that "the landing of North American troops" be included among the aspects to be investigated.[12]

Two days later (May 3), in support of resolutions introduced by Mexico and Chile calling upon the U.S. to end its intervention,[13] Oribe urged the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces "which," he said, "are in the Dominican Republic

---

[11] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 14 (rev.), May 28, 1965, pp. 12-13.

[12] Ibid., Doc. 24 (rev.), May 27, 1965, p. 17.

[13] Ibid., Doc. 8, May 1, 1965, and Doc. 10, May 1, 1965, respectively.

contrary to international law and the OAS Charter."[14] Referring to President Johnson's speech of the preceding evening,[15] Oribe pointed out that the mission of U.S. forces in preventing the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere "goes far beyond the inter-American agreements for defense against communism existing at this time."[16] He reminded the delegates that the Eighth Meeting of Consultation at Punta del Este in 1962 established that a communist régime was incompatible with the Charter of the OAS and that any nation adopting such form of government might be temporarily excluded from participation in the regional organization. "We have not reached the point," he continued, "of authorizing a collective action, and much less a unilateral action . . . for preventing the establishment of a communist-type government in any of our countries."[17]

On May 5, during the Ministers' debate on the creation of an inter-American peace force,[18] Uruguay's criticism

---

[14] Ibid., Doc. 32 (rev.), May 27, 1965, p. 19.

[15] Supra, pp. 52-53.

[16] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 32 (rev.), May 27, 1965, p. 21.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Infra, pp. 69-72.

---

[16] Ibid., Doc. 81 (rev.), May 27, 1960, p. 33.

[15] Ibid., pp. 45-53.

[14] Informe Anual de Comercio, Doc. 32 (rev.), May 27, 1959, p. 33.

[13] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., pp. 53-57.

of the U.S. intervention reached its peak. In a lengthy statement in defense of existing inter-American agreements, Oribe analyzed the salient features and implications of the U.S. action. Noting the continuing buildup of U.S. forces in the Dominican Republic and referring once again to President Johnson's speech of May 2, Oribe spoke of "a fundamental change in U.S. policy toward the nations of the South." [Italics not in the original.] He continued:

> The United States has clearly proclaimed that its leaders, deeply preoccupied by their experiences with Cuba and the Cold War, now assume as their sovereign right the unilateral use of armed force anywhere in the Continent with the declared objective of preventing . . . the establishment of any more communist regimes in America, be it as a result of foreign intervention or of direct action by native elements. Such, in effect, is the nucleus of what has now been called the Johnson Doctrine.[19]

After tracing the development, and subsequent repudiation, of the Roosevelt Corollary of 1904, Oribe continued:

> It is necessary to emphasize that as a program of unilateral U.S. political action the Johnson Doctrine . . . can extend much farther than the old corollaries of the Monroe Doctrine. Three special features appear in the very grave and dangerous outline for the future of Latin American States . . . . In the first place, the new doctrine is a doctrine of preventive action. It concerns preventing the establishment of a specific type of government in the Americas . . . . In the second place, the new doctrine doesn't seem to attempt to distinguish whether the movements which should be repressed under its aegis respond to native or foreign aspirations . . . . In the third place, [it] affects the nature of the society and of the state and the very political system of the government of a nation,

---

[19] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 40 (rev.), June 2, 1965, p. 21.

of the U.S. intervention reached its peak. In a lengthy statement in defense of existing Inter-American agreements, Quincy analyzed the salient features and implications of the U.S. action. Noting the contentions backing of U.S. forces in the Dominican Republic and reiterating once again to Pennsylvania's senator at may 1, Drike stated we "a sundamen-tal change in U.S. policy toward the nations of the Hemisphere [Letter not in the original.] has occurred."

> The United States has clearly proclaimed that its lawless, deeply preoccupied by their experiences with Cuba and the cold war, has assumed as their exclusive right the unilateral use of armed force anywhere in the Continent with the declared objective of preventing . . . the establishment of any more communist regimes in America, be it as a result of foreign intervention or of direct action by native elements. Such, in effect, is the nature of what has now been called the Johnson doctrine.[1]

After tracing the development, and subsequent repudiation, of the Roosevelt corollary of 1904, Drike continued:

> It is necessary to emphasize that as a precept of unilateral U.S. political action the Brennan Doctrine . . . can extend much further than the old corollary of the Monroe Doctrine. There special features appear in the very grave and dangerous outline for the future of Latin American states . . . In the first place, the Sorrian is a doctrine of preventive action. It concerns preventing the establishment of a specific type of government in the Americas . . . In the second place, the new doctrine seems to attempt to distinguish whether the movements which should be repressed under its aegis compared to native or foreign agitations . . . In the third place, [it] affects the nature of the society and of the state and the very political system of the government of a nation,

---

[1] "Doctrina Brennan de Coburgo," Dec. 10 (rev.), June 1, 1965, p. 11.

> instead of concerning itself, as did the old Roosevelt Corollary, with problems of ports and customs houses and the repayment of loans and financial obligations.[20]

Refuting the allegation that the U.S. action was justified because of the slowness of the OAS mechanisms during times of urgency, as well as the Charter's absolute prohibition of intervention, the Uruguayan Ambassador outlined the steps taken by the OAS during the Cuban missile crisis in October, 1962, and argued that only twenty-four hours were required to authorize the naval and air blockade which followed.

Oribe then expressed his delegation's surprise that the U.S. had thought it necessary to resort to a unilateral use of force prior to consultation with the regional body. He enumerated the OAS mechanisms which could have been utilized by the U.S. prior to its intervention, e.g., the Meeting of Consultation, the Inter-American Peace Committee, the OAS Council, and the Caracas Declaration of 1954.[21] The

---

[20] Ibid., p. 22.

[21] Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States against the Intervention of International Communism: "The Tenth Inter-American Conference declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State on the part of the international communist movement . . . . will constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States which would place in danger the peace of America and would necessitate a Meeting of Consultation to consider the adoption of means according to existing treaties."

---

[70] Ibid., p. 13.

[71] Declaration of Solidarity for the Preservation of the Political Integrity of the American States against the Intervention of International Communism: "The Tenth Inter-American Conference declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State on the part of the international communist movement . . . will constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States which would place in danger the peace of America and would necessitate a meeting of Consultation to consider the adoption of means according to existing treaties."

latter mechanism, Oribe added, "was introduced into inter-American law by the U.S. Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, for the express purpose of utilizing it, when [such an] occasion should arrive."[22]

III. SUPPORT, WITH RESERVATIONS, FOR THE OAS SPECIAL COMMISSION TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In spite of its opposition to the U.S. intervention and the convocation of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, Uruguay voted in favor of the resolution establishing a five-man investigative commission to be sent to Santo Domingo, but it did so with reservations.[23] The primary aspect to be investigated by the Commission, according to the Uruguayan delegation, should have been the landing of U.S. troops rather than the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic. Also, while supporting the functions of the Commission dealing with mediation and conciliation, Uruguay insisted that there should have been included in the resolution the phrase: "To solicit the Government of the United States to withdraw the armed forces which it has sent to the Dominican Republic."[24]

---

[22] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 40 (rev.), June 2, 1965, p. 28.

[23] For text of the resolution, see Appendix C.

[24] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 14 (rev.), May 28, 1965, pp. 12-14.

[illegible] resolution, Uruba added, "was introduced like [illegible] American law by the U.N. Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, for the express purpose of utilizing it, when [such an] occasion should arrive."[22]

III. REPORTS, WITH RECOMMENDATIONS, FROM THE OAS INVESTIGATING COMMISSION TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

In spite of its opposition to the U.S. intervention and the convocation of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, Uruguay voted in favor of the resolution establishing a five-man investigative commission to be sent to Santo Domingo, but it did so with reservations.[23] The primary aspect to be investigated by the Commission, according to the Uruguayan delegation, should have been the landing of U.S. troops rather than the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic. Also, while supporting the functions of the Commission dealing with mediation and conciliation, Uruguay insisted that there should have been included in the resolution the purpose: "To solicit the Government of the United States to withdraw the armed forces which it has sent to the Dominican Republic."[24]

[illegible] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 60 (rev.), June 5, 1965, p. 2.

[illegible] For text of the resolution, see Appendix E.

[illegible] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 74 (rev.), May 20, 1965, pp. 12-14.

Established on the evening of May 1, by a vote of 19 to 0 (Chile abstained), the Commission was made up of delegates from Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, and Panama, and it departed for Santo Domingo early the following morning.

IV. OPPOSITION TO THE CREATION OF THE INTER-AMERICAN PEACE FORCE

In taking upon itself the task of preventing a possible communist takeover in the Dominican Republic, the Johnson Administration had sent in large numbers of U.S. forces, had officially advised the OAS after the action had been taken, and had offered to the Tenth Meeting of Consultation two resolutions transferring responsibility to the regional organization. The first resolution provided for an OAS presence on the island through the medium of the Special Commission; the second was a proposal for the establishment of an inter-American force (IAF) to be sent to Santo Domingo to facilitate the work of the Commission. Both resolutions were introduced on May 1.

While the proposal for an investigative commission was both debated and adopted on the same day, the resolution calling for the establishment of a multilateral OAS force introduced important changes to inter-American agreements and provoked a long debate. Although it is not within the

scope of this thesis to dwell at length upon the numerous considerations surrounding the creation of the IAF, it will nevertheless be useful to summarize in capsule form the opposing positions taken by the Latin American nations.

Those countries which opposed the creation of the inter-American force did so primarily because they wished to maintain intact the acknowledged cornerstone of the inter-American system--the principle of nonintervention. The creation of a multilateral force would, in their opinion, not only seriously weaken that principle but would also have grave implications for the principles of sovereignty and juridical equality. These principles, they argued, had provided some measure of protection against possible economic and military leverage on the part of the United States. They, therefore, felt that the unilateral action of the United States in the Dominican Republic should not be given the appearance of legal sanction by substituting for it a collective OAS action. Adopting this position were Mexico, Chile, Uruguay, Ecuador, and Peru.

The nations which favored the creation of the inter-American force were those which deemed that the principle of nonintervention should not be a shield behind which other principles of the inter-American system might be violated, for example, respect for human rights and the effective exercise of representative democracy. In relation to the

Dominican crisis, they deemed such a force necessary to prevent the situation from deteriorating to the extent that either a military dictatorship of the Right or a Castro-type dictatorship of the Left might result. In general, they saw in the proposal a means of strengthening the inter-American system and safeguarding the principles contained in the OAS Charter.[25]

After several days of deliberation, the resolution was voted upon in the early morning hours of May 6 and approved by a vote of 14-5 (Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay), with one abstention (Venezuela).[26]

In explaining Uruguay's negative vote, Oribe reiterated his government's opinion that the Tenth Meeting of Consultation was considering a matter wholly within the internal jurisdiction of the Dominican Republic. The illegality of the U.S. intervention, he argued, "should not be regularized through the creation of a new international force."[27] Any type of collective action, he continued, could only be justified under Article 19 of the OAS Charter, which permits such action for the maintenance of peace and

---

[25] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 29 (rev.), May 27, 1965; Doc. 32 (rev.), May 27, 1965; Doc. 40 (rev.), June 2, 1965.

[26] For the text of the resolution, see Appendix D.

[27] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 41 (rev.), June 8, 1965, p. 4.

Dominican crisis, they deemed such a force necessary to prevent the extension from deteriorating to the extent that either a military dictatorship of the right or a Castro-type dictatorship of the left might result. In general, they saw in the proposal a means of strengthening the Inter-American system and safeguarding the principles contained in the OAS Charter.[25]

After several days of deliberation, the resolution was voted upon in the early morning hours of May 6 and approved by a vote of 14-5 (Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Peru, and Uruguay), with one abstention (Venezuela).[26]

In explaining Uruguay's negative vote, Carlos Velazquez Rodriguez, Uruguay's Permanent Representative to the OAS, stated that his government's opinion that the Tenth Meeting of Consultation was convening a matter wholly within the internal jurisdiction of the Dominican Republic. The illegality of the U.S. intervention, he argued, should not be regularized through the creation of a new international force.[27] Any type of collective action, he continued, could only be justified under Article 19 of the OAS Charter, which permits such action for the maintenance of peace and

---

[25] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 39 (rev.), May 27, 1965; Doc. 37 (rev.), May 27, 1965; Doc. 40 (rev.), June 2, 1965.

[26] For the text of the resolution, see Appendix D.

[27] Décima Reunión de Consulta, Doc. 41 (rev.), June 9, 1965, p. 4.

security in accordance with existing treaties.[28] The Dominican crisis, he reminded the Meeting of Consultation, had not been formally declared as having placed in danger the peace and security of the Continent. In summary, Oribe emphasized Uruguay's strict interpretation of, and unyielding adherence to, the principles contained in Articles 15, 17, and 19 of the Charter.

---

[28] OAS Charter, Article 19: "Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in Articles 15 and 17."

security in accordance with existing treaties.[24] The Dominican crisis, he asserted the meeting of Consultation, had not been formally declared as having placed in danger the peace and security of the Americas. In summary, Cribbs emphasized Guyana's strict interpretation of, and unyielding adherence, the principles contained in Articles 15, 17, and 18 of the Charter.

---

[24]OAS Charter, Article 19: "Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in Articles 15 and 17."

CHAPTER VI

THE URUGUAYAN POSITION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

As a non-permanent member of the United Nations Security Council at the time of the Dominican crisis, Uruguay used the occasion to voice her firm adherence to the juridical obligations established by international law. The violation of such obligations, Uruguay argued, would result in anarchy within the community of nations. Based upon this position, the Uruguayan representative condemned the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic as a violation of existing international agreements and introduced a resolution affirming U.N. competence in regional affairs.

I. CRITICISM OF THE U.S. INTERVENTION

On May 3, 1965, the United Nations Security Council met at the request of the USSR "to consider the question of the armed interference by the United States in the internal affairs of the Dominican Republic."[1] From the beginning, however, it could be seen that the question was being

---

[1]United Nations, Security Council, Verbatim Minutes of the One Thousand One Hundred Ninety-Sixth Meeting of the Security Council (New York, 1965), S/PV 1196, May 3, 1965, p. 3. [Hereafter cited as UNSC Minutes.]

[1] United Nations, Security Council, Provisional Minutes of the one thousand three hundred-sixth Meeting of the Security Council (New York, 1955), 327th plen., May 7, 1955, p. 3. Hereafter cited as UNSC Minutes.

debated in terms reminiscent of past US-Soviet confrontations. Not limiting himself solely to the circumstances surrounding the Dominican situation, Soviet Ambassador Nikolai Fedorenko used the occasion to characterize the U.S. intervention as another example of "United States imperialism." According to Fedorenko:

> This new aggressive act . . . , the military intervention in the Dominican Republic, is being carried out, as were the acts of the colonialists in the past, under the tattered and false excuse of the defense of American lives.[2]

Referring to the American claim that the intervention of communism was a factor in the Dominican revolution, the Soviet representative stated that "once again, the bogey of anti-Communism has been dragged out"[3] and "American leading circles ever more frequently resort to armed interference in the affairs of other countries that are struggling for national liberation."[4]

A week later, referring to the role being played by the OAS, Fedorenko alleged that:

> . . . under pressure from the United States the Organization of American States has taken an unprecedented and illegal set of actions which have resulted in the creation of the so-called inter-American armed forces. These actions . . . are designed not to put an end to but to mask the aggression committed by the United States.[5]

---

[2] Ibid., p. 6. [3] Ibid., p. 12. [4] Ibid., p. 21.

[5] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1204, May 11, 1965, p. 22.

debated in terms reminiscent of past US-Soviet confronta-
tions. Not limiting himself only to the circumstances
surrounding the Dominican situation, Senior Ambassador
Mikoyan endeavored used the occasion to reconsider the U.S.
intervention as another example of "ruthless imperial-
ism." According to Izvestiya:

> This new aggressive act . . . the military occu-
> pation of the Dominican Republic, is being carried
> out, as were the acts of the colonialists in the
> past, under the fabricated and false excuse of the
> defense of American lives.[3]

Referring to the American claim that the intervention of
communism was a factor in the Dominican revolution, the
Soviet representative stated that "once again, the bogey of
anti-Communism has been dragged out"[4] and Americans leading
circles ever more frequently resort to armed interference in
the affairs of other countries that are struggling for
national liberation."[5]

A week later, referring to the role being played by the
OAS, Pravda stated that:

> . . . under pressure from the United States the
> Organization of American states has taken an unprece-
> dented and illegal set of actions which have resulted
> in the creation of the so-called Inter-American armed
> forces. These actions . . . are designed not to put
> an end to but to cover the aggressive committed by the
> United States.[6]

---

[3] Izvestiya, p. 6. [4] Ibid., p. 12. [5] Ibid., p. 21.

[6] New Times, 3/67 1:04, May 17, 1965, p. 25.

Fedorenko specifically charged the United States with having violated Article 2, paragraph 4, of the UN Charter[6] and introduced a draft resolution condemning the U.S. action and demanding the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from the Dominican Republic.[7]

Adlai Stevenson, the U.S. representative in the Security Council, justified his country's action primarily on humanitarian grounds but referred also to the intrusion of communist elements in the Dominican revolt. Stevenson declared that "revolution in any country is a matter for that country to deal with. It becomes a matter calling for hemispheric action only--and I repeat, only--when the object is the establishment of a communistic dictatorship."[8] Quoting from President Johnson's televised address of May 2nd, Stevenson emphasized that:

> The American nations will not permit the establishment of another communist government in the Western hemisphere. This was the unanimous view of all the American nations when in January 1962 they declared, "The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system." This is, and this will be, the common action and the common purpose of the democratic forces of the hemisphere, as President Johnson has

---

[6] UN Charter, Article 2, paragraph 4: "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

[7] UNSC Draft Resolution, S/6328, May 4, 1965.

[8] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1196, May 3, 1965, p. 43.

Secretary Rusk specifically charged the United States with having violated Article 1, paragraph 4, of the UN Charter[5] and announced a three resolution amendment (the fail, action and demanding the immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from the Dominican Republic.[6]

Chief Ophuysen, the U.N. representative in the Security Council, described his country's policy neutrality on humanitarian grounds but declared also in the interest of communist elements in the Dominican revolt. Ophuysen declared that revolution in any country is a matter for that country to deal with. It becomes a matter calling for hemispheric action only--and I stress, only--when the subject is the establishment of a communist dictatorship," thus-ing Lyon President Johnson's belayed address to May 2nd. Stevenson emphasized that:

> The Americans nations will not permit the establishment of another communist government in the Western Hemisphere. This was the unanimous view of all the American nations when in January 1961 they declared: "The principles of communism are incompatible with the principles of the inter-American system." This is, and this will be, the common purpose of the democratic forces of the hemisphere, as therefore, whose may

---

[5] UN Charter, Article 2, paragraph 4: "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

[6] Time Magazine, 87:24 (196), May 3, 1965, p. 43.

> said. For the danger is also a common danger and the principles are common principles. So we have acted to summon the resources of this entire hemisphere to this task.[9]

On the second day of deliberations on the Dominican situation, the Uruguayan representative, Carlos María Velázquez, stated his government's views in respect to the U.S. intervention. After referring to the position taken by Uruguay in the OAS, Velázquez said:

> . . . The position of my Government, I think, rests squarely within the strict Latin American juridical tradition.
>
> The Charter of the Organization of American States . . . was the culmination of a lengthy process, arduous at times, that was intended to establish certain basic guarantees without which inter-American co-existence ran the risk, as history had already proved, of turning into anarchy or the despotism of the strongest, and the very crux of that entire system and network of guarantees was to be vested in the principle of non-intervention.[10]

Criticizing the landing of U.S. troops on Dominican soil as a violation of Article 15 of the OAS Charter, Velázquez argued that President Johnson's statement of May 2nd could not be advanced as a legal fiat:

> . . . . This Johnson doctrine cannot be considered a legal doctrine, for the idea embedded in it is that, although revolutions may constitute prima facie domestic problems which the countries themselves have to solve, they cease to be so and they call for hemispheric action when the object is to establish a

---

[9] Ibid., p. 41.

[10] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1198, May 4, 1965, p. 5.

said. "So the danger is also a common interest and the principles are common principles. It is our duty to ensure the exclusion of this entire hemisphere to this task."[9]

On the second day of deliberations on the Dominican situation, the Uruguayan representative, Carlos María Velázquez, invited his colleagues' views to clarify to the U.S. intervention, after reference to the position taken by Uruguay in the UNO, Velázquez said:

> . . . the position of my Government, I think, rests squarely within the rules [sic] American juridical traditions.
>
> The Charter of the Organization of American States . . . was the culmination of a lengthy process, arduous at times, that was intended to establish certain basic guarantees within which inter-American co-existence can the rich, as history had already proved, if treading into obscurity or the dangerous of the strongest, and the very core of that entire system was a network of guarantees was to be vested in the principle of non-intervention.[10]

Criticizing the landing of U.S. troops on Dominican soil as a violation of Article 15 of the OAS Charter, Velázquez argued that President Johnson's statement of May 2nd could not be advanced as a legal fiat:

> . . . This Johnson doctrine cannot be considered a legal doctrine, for the rules embodied in it [sic] that, although evolutions may constitute prima facie domestic grounds which the countries themselves have to solve, they cease to be so and they call for immediate effort when the object is to establish a

---

[9] Ibid., p. 61.

[10] New York Times, May 4, 1965, p. 3.

> communist doctrine. That seems to go further in scope than all the norms extant in the inter-American system . . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> This doctrine, as its old ancestor, the doctrine of President Monroe . . . is not only a political statement . . . but expresses unilateral views, issued under the exclusive responsibility of the Government of the United States.[11]

In reference to President Johnson's assertion that the legal basis for such a doctrine rested upon the decision taken by the OAS at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation in 1962, Velázquez pointed out--as did Oribe in the OAS--that the decision referred to by President Johnson provided for the exclusion of a communist government from participation in the organs of the inter-American system but did not go so far as to authorize preventive action to forestall the establishment of communist régimes.[12]

Velázquez concluded his remarks that day by emphasizing the importance which Uruguay places upon the strict adherence to existing juridical norms:

> . . . from very early on in its own historic experience--one that was as painful as that of the other Latin American nations--my country knew full well the need that the world be effectively regulated by respect for the laws of international morality and the set-up of legality . . . . The fate of the small nations gradually, if all this is to be lost, is to become most hazardous. Our position is far from obeying what some realistic minds might call beatitude or religious attachment to legality. We apply a

---

[11] Ibid., pp. 7-11.

[12] Ibid.

communist doctrine. That seems to go further in scope than all the moves related to the Inter-American system . . .

. . . . . .

This doctrine, as its old supporter, the Secretary of Treasury Dodge . . . is not only a political statement . . . but evidences political views. Issued under the exclusive responsibility of the Government of the United States.[11]

In reference to President Johnson's assertion that the legal basis for such a doctrine rested upon the decision taken by the OAS at the Eighth Meeting of Consultation in 1962, Veliz-Rojas pointed out--as did Cuba in the Inter-American Council--that the Resolution provided for the exclusion of a Communist government from participation in the organs of the Inter-American system but did not go so far as to authorize preventive action or forestall the establishment of Communist regimes.[12]

Veliz-Rojas concluded his remarks that day by emphasizing the importance which Uruguay places upon the strict adherence to existing juridical norms:

. . . face very early on in its own calendar [sic] experience--the case was as familiar as that of other Latin American nations--my country [sic] felt well its duty that the world be effectively regulated by respect for the laws of international morality and the rule-by of legality . . . . The fact [sic] remain national community, it all this is to be [sic], it be become most [illegible]. Our practice [illegible] copying most [illegible] might call [illegible] tude of [illegible] attachment to legality. We apply a

---

[11]Ibid., pp. 7-11. [12]Ibid.

> realistic attitude toward the law, and this is an example which we think could be followed. We, the small nations, feel that the strict application of juridical norms--that is, to ensure juridical security--constitutes one of the cornerstones of our own security [italics not in the original]. And, if I may be allowed to say so, the great may stretch the texts as far as they like, because, when all is said and done, if it is a question of taking political decisions based upon the will and not upon reason, it is they, the great, who can dictate such decisions. We, the small nations, need to cleave intransigently to the norms of law [italics not in the original]. We must know, for reasons of our national interest, just how far we can go, and ultimately--and this is the most important--how far we can be dragged.[13]

II. THE URUGUAYAN RESOLUTION OF MAY 11, 1965: AN ASSERTION OF U.N. COMPETENCE IN REGIONAL AFFAIRS

In contrast to the active role being played by the OAS, the Security Council failed to take early action because of a deadlock which arose over the question of jurisdiction between the regional and universal organizations. While the Soviet representative stressed the priority of the U.N. in dealing with matters affecting international peace and security, the U.S. representative repeatedly referred to the effectiveness of the regional organization and its priority of competence in handling the Dominican dispute. The smaller nations, meanwhile, became concerned at the

---

[13] Ibid., p. 16.

realistic attitude toward the law, and this is an example which we think could be followed. We, too, seek nations, first that the actual application of juridical principles--that is, to ensure juridical security--constitutes one of the cornerstones of our own security. Treaties not in the original. And, if they be allowed to say so, the vessel may stretch the bonds as far as they like, because, when all is said and done, if it is a question of taking political decisions based upon the will and not upon reason, it is they, the great, who can dictate such decisions. We, the small nations, need to observe international to the terms of law [italics not in the original]. And, we must grow, for reasons of our national interest, just how far we can go, and ultimately--and this is the most important--how far we can be dragged.[13]

---

[13] Ibid., p. 16.

inactivity of the Security Council in the face of the U.S.-Soviet impasse, and the question of jurisdictional priority assumed increasing importance.

In explaining Uruguay's approach to the relationship between the OAS and the U.N. Velázquez cited the words spoken by the head of the Uruguayan delegation at the Ninth Session of the General Assembly:

> My country combines membership in the United Nations with membership in the Organization of American States in the belief that the principles of the regional system and the safeguards which it offers cannot be invoked in order to prevent States from having direct and immediate access to the jurisdiction of the United Nations or to deprive them, no matter how temporarily, of the protection of the agencies of the world community. The legal protection afforded by both systems should be combined, never substituted for one another . . . .

Addressing himself to the Dominican crisis, Velázquez continued:

> . . . my delegation has no doubt whatever regarding the competence of the Security Council to deal with, and to continue to deal with, any controversial dispute the extension of which may endanger international peace and security, even if such a controversy is at present under examination in a regional body . . . .[14]

By May 11, it appeared that the deadlock reached in the Security Council debate might prevent any action whatever. With this in mind and in view of the seemingly-deteriorating situation in Santo Domingo, Uruguay made the

---

[14] Ibid., pp. 11-12. See also, Uruguayan Institute of International Law, Uruguay and the UN (New York: Manhattan Publishing Co., 1958), p. 17.

inactivity of the Security Council in the wake of the U.S.-Soviet impasse, and the question of jurisdictional primacy assumed increasing importance.

In explaining Europe's approach to the relationship between the UN and the U.N. Velásquez cited the words spoken by the head of the Norwegian delegation to the first session of the General Assembly:

> My country considers membership in the United Nations with reservation in the Organization of American States in the belief that the principles of the regional system and its safeguards which it offers cannot be invoked in order to prevent states from having direct and immediate access to the jurisdiction of the United Nations or to deprive them, no matter how temporarily, of the protection of the guarantees of the world community. The legal protection afforded by both systems should be combined, never substituted for one another . . .

Addressing himself to the Panamian utility, Velásquez continued:

> . . . My delegation was so opposed to delaying the competence of the Security Council to deal with, and to continue to deal with, any controversial dispute the existence of which may endanger international peace and security, even if such a controversy is at present under consideration in a regional body . . .[14]

By May 1948 it appeared that the Bogotá Pact would be the security channel de facto rights prevent any action whatever. Action this is what was in view of the seemingly-

---

[14]Ibid., pp. 11-12. See also, Organization of American States, The Pan American Union (Washington and the OAS (New York: Manhattan Publishing Co., 1963), p. 17.

first move to present a draft resolution aimed at prodding the Council into action. In doing so, Velázquez stated his country's concern not only for events in the Dominican Republic but also for the continuing effectiveness of the U.N. in the maintenance of international peace and security.

Referring to the lack of agreement among the members of the Council, Velázquez observed:

> . . . in view of the statements that have been made in the course of this debate, I think we must conclude that there is no unanimous agreement in the Security Council regarding the substantive decisions that the Council might adopt. In the view of my delegation, this is the most serious of all the facts before us, because the absence of a decision by the Security Council would imply, regardless of the doctrinaire or theoretical statements that might be made, the inability of the Council to fulfill its duties . . . . the result would be to delay or undermine the effective application of the legal guarantees against aggression as set forth in the Charter. But this damage would not only be done to small nations. The United Nations itself would be damaged, and the Security Council would be damaged. The prestige and authority of the Organization might be seriously jeopardized at a time in its history when, for reasons well known to all of us, it is the duty of every member to do everything in its power to strenghthen the Organization, and not to weaken it even further.
>
> Therefore, confronted by this picture, my delegation feels that the only road open to us is to try to reach agreement on a draft resolution which, without pronouncing itself at this stage of the debate on the substance of the question, would nevertheless allow the Council to exercise its competence [italics not in the original] and, at the same time, unequivocally to state its authority. Although this might be the only course open to the Council at the moment, I believe that this course would be preferable to having the

> debate end without adopting any draft resolution whatever.[15]

The resolution introduced by Uruguay, while taking note of the measures already adopted by the OAS, reaffirmed Article 24 of the UN Charter which confers upon the Security Council "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security." Velázquez argued:

> Temporary priority of the regional organization . . . only refers to the type of international controversy which might be settled peacefully by negotiation, and not situations of the present case, which are accompanied by charges of aggression.[16]

Citing also the articles of the charters of the U.N. and the OAS which refer to the principle of nonintervention, the Uruguayan resolution reaffirmed the right of the Dominican people to exercise, without coercion, their right of self-determination. In addition, it called upon the OAS to keep the Security Council informed of its actions in the Dominican Republic and to cooperate with the U.N. Secretary-General in the implementation of the resolution. Most importantly, however, it "invite[d] the Secretary-General to follow closely the events in the Dominican Republic and to take such measures as he may deem appropriate for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on all aspects of

---

[15] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1204, May 11, 1965, pp. 6-7.

[16] Ibid., pp. 8-10.

[illegible] and without according any great resolution
whatever."[15]

The resolution introduced by Uruguay, while taking
note of the measures already adopted by the OAS, reaffirmed
Article 24 of the UN Charter which confers upon the Security
Council "primary responsibility for the maintenance of inter-
national peace and security." Veiled[sic] argued:

> Temporary priority of the regional organization
> . . . only exists in the type of international con-
> troversy which may be settled peacefully by negoti-
> ation, and not situations of the present case
> which are accompanied by charges of aggression.[16]

Citing also the articles of the Charters of the U.N. and the
OAS which refer to the principle of nonintervention, the
Uruguayan resolution reaffirmed the right of the Dominican
people to exercise, without coercion, their right of self-
determination. In addition, it called upon the OAS to keep
the Security Council informed of its actions in its capabil-
ities and to cooperate with the U.N. Secretary-
General in the implementation of the resolution. Most
importantly, however, it "implied[sic] the Secretary-General to
follow closely the events in the Dominican Republic and to
take such measures as he may deem appropriate for the pur-
pose of reporting to the Security Council on all aspects of

---

[15] New Yorker, 37:9 1504, May 11, 1965, pp. 6-7.

[16] Ibid., pp. 6-10.

the situation."[17] The latter provision, while not specifically stating so, vaguely suggested the presence of the Secretary-General or his representative in Santo Domingo and was generally interpreted in that light.[18]

Velázquez soon discovered, however, that his resolution failed to satisfy at least two of the five permanent members of the Council. The USSR found it lacking because it failed to condemn explicitly the U.S. intervention, while the U.S. criticized it because it might "tend to complicate the activities of the Organization of American States by encouraging concurrent and independent considerations and activities by the Council."[19]

Before the Uruguayan resolution could be brought to a vote, however, events in Santo Domingo precipitated an emergency meeting of the Security Council on May 14. On the preceding evening, Secretary-General U Thant received a telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Constitutionalist Government of the Dominican Republic, which

---

[17] UNSC Draft Resolution, S/6346, May 11, 1965. For text of the resolution, see Appendix E.

[18] An editorial in El País [Montevideo], May 17, 1965, criticized "the abandonment of regional competence" and lamented that "in such an unfortunate episode we see Uruguay in a position contrary to its obligations to regional solidarity . . . ."

[19] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1204, May 11, 1965, p. 42.

the situation. [17] The Latin revolution, until not specifically existing as vaguely supported the presence of the Secretary-General de bis representatives in Santo Domingo and was generally interpreted in that light."[18]

Validated soon discovered, however, that his resolution failed to satisfy at least two of the five permanent members of the Council. The USSR found it lacking because it failed to condemn explicitly the U.S. intervention, while the U.S. criticized it because it might "serve to complicate the activities of the organization of American states by encouraging concurrent and independent consultations and activities by the Council."[19]

Before the Uruguayan resolution could be brought to a vote, however, events in Santo Domingo precipitated an emergency meeting of the Security Council on May 14. On this preceding evening, Secretary-General U Thant received a telegram from the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Dominican Republic, which

---

[17] "Dark Night Resolution," S/6744, May 13, 1965. For text of the resolution, see Appendix B.

[18] As reported in El Pais (Montevideo), May 17, 1965; criticized "the abandonment of regional competence" and lamented that "In each an unfortunate episode we see Europe in a position contrary to its obligations to national sovereignty . . ."

[19] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1204, May 13, 1965, p. 44.

accused U.S. forces of proceeding beyond the positions assigned them in the security zone and of supporting the forces of the military junta in an attack upon the Constitutionalist forces of Colonel Caamaño.[20]

At this point, a resolution was hastily drafted by Jordan, Malaysia, and the Ivory Coast to deal with the immediate situation. Adopted unanimously by the Council, the resolution "invite[d] the Secretary-General to send, as an urgent measure, a Representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on the present situation."[21]

According to Velázquez, the differences between the Uruguayan resolution of May 11 and that adopted on May 14 were significant. Whereas the former would have given the Secretary-General an authorization, in somewhat vague terms, "to follow closely" the events in the Dominican Republic and "to take such measures as he may deem appropriate" in order to report to the Security Council, the latter specifically authorized him "to send a representative," thus calling for the direct intervention of the U.N. Latin American opinion,

---

[20] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1208, May 14, 1965, pp. 2-5.

[21] UNSC Resolution, S/Res/203, May 14, 1965. For text of the resolution, see Appendix F.

accused U.N. forces of proceeding beyond the positions assigned them in the security zone and of supporting the forces of the military junta in an attack upon the Constitutionalist forces of Colonel Caamaño.[10]

At this point, a resolution was hastily drafted by Jordan, Uruguay, and the Ivory Coast in lieu with the immediate action. Adopted unanimously by the Council, the resolution "invited] the Secretary-General to send, as an urgent measure, a Representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on the present situation."[11]

According to Feinberg, the difference between the Uruguayan resolution of May 11 and that adopted on May 14 were significant. Whereas the former would have given the Secretary-General an elaboration, in somewhat vague terms, "to follow closely the events in the Dominican Republic and to take such measures as he may deem appropriate" in order to report to the Security Council, the latter specifically authorized him "to send a representative," thus calling for the direct intervention of the U.N. in Latin American opinion.

---

[10] *New York Times*, May 13, 1965, pp. 1-3.

[11] *United Resolution*, S/Res/203, May 14, 1965. For text of the resolution, see Appendix B.

nevertheless, was generally critical of the Uruguayan position.[22]

The result of the Council's action on May 14 was to inject, for the very first time, the physical presence of the U.N. into a regional dispute. With this accomplished, the Council resumed its deliberations, at Fedorenko's insistence, on the Soviet resolution of May 4 demanding the withdrawal of U.S. forces.

On May 21, the Soviet resolution was finally brought to a vote, but only the USSR voted in favor of it.[23] Fedorenko then introduced into the pending Uruguayan resolution an amendment condemning the U.S. intervention and calling for the withdrawal of U.S. forces. This amendment, voted upon separately on May 22, was likewise defeated.[24]

Although the Uruguayan resolution had, in effect, been superseded by the Council's resolution of May 14, it too was brought to a vote but received the support of only France, Jordan, Malaysia, and the Ivory Coast, in addition to Uruguay. The USSR voted against it because of its

---

[22] La Mañana [Montevideo], May 30, 1965, reported the critical attitude noted in much of Latin America toward the Uruguayan position in the U.N.

[23] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1214, May 21, 1965, pp. 61-62.

[24] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1216, May 22, 1965, pp. 31-35.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

references to the OAS, while the United States and Bolivia voiced their abstention because it failed to give sufficient recognition and encouragement to the role being played by the regional organization. Also abstaining were China, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.[25]

The assertion of U.N. competence in regional affairs turned out to be the only substantive action taken by the Security Council during the first month of the Dominican crisis. Although its representatives in Santo Domingo sent back daily reports of their activities, it became increasingly clear that the U.S. and the OAS were having considerably more influence upon the shaping of events in the strife-torn island than was the U.N.

Obviously disappointed with the minimum role assumed by the United Nations and apprehensive of the course taken by the OAS Tenth Meeting of Consultation, Velázquez stated on June 7:

> . . . . It is with particular concern that we consider the possibility that this unfortunate episode of the Dominican Republic may serve as a pretext for the adoption of political formulas which, under the shadow of multilateralism--equally vague and imprecise--might in the future be used to justify intervention in any other Latin American country.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In the meantime, and until the machinery has been

---

[25] Ibid.

reference to the OAS, while the United States and Bolivia voiced their objection because it failed to give sufficient recognition and encouragement to the role being played by the regional organization. Also abstaining were China, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom.[22]

The assertion of U.S. complacency in regional affairs turned out to be the only substantive action taken by the Security Council during the first month of the Dominican crisis. Although its representatives in Santo Domingo sent back daily reports of shots exchanged, it became increasingly clear that the U.S. and the OAS were having considerably more influence upon the shooting of events in the strife-torn island than was the U.N.

Obviously disappointed with the minimum role assumed by the United Nations and apprehensive of the threats posed by the OAS Tenth Meeting of Consultation, Tejchmus stated on June 1:

> . . . It is with particular concern that we consider the possibility that this unprecedented attack of the Dominican Republic may serve as a precedent for the adoption of political measures which, under the shadow of multilateralism--usually vague and imprecise--might in the future be used to justify intervention in any other Latin American country.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In the meantime, as until the machinery has been

---

[22] Ibid.

> set up to allow the effective exercise of a police force by the international community, we must once again reaffirm the old concepts which still apply and which still provide the sole shield to protect the weak [italics not in the original].[26]

The Uruguayan position in the United Nations Security Council can best be summarized, therefore, as one of unyielding adherence to the legal precepts embodied in international law. Critical of the U.S. intervention and opposed to the course adopted by the OAS, the Uruguayan representative sought to inject the influence of the United Nations into the Dominican dispute in an attempt to counter-balance the multilateral action sanctioned by the regional organization. This was done, it seems, not so much on the merits of the Dominican question itself but rather on the principle that the small nations of the world must be uncompromising in the conviction that their principal source of protection lies within the legal guarantees provided by international law.

---

[26] UNSC Minutes, S/PV 1221, June 7, 1965, pp. 41-42.

[illegible] by the effective execution of a police force by the international community. We must once again [illegible] the old concepts which still exist but which still provide the main points [illegible] the [illegible] not in the original.[55]

The Hungarian question in the United Nations Security Council can also be summarized, therefore, as one of upholding adherence to the legal concepts prevailing in international law. Critical of the West, intervention was rejected as the course adopted by the USA, the Hungarian representative sought to infer the influence of the Cairo meeting into the Western action amounting to the subsequent organization. This was done, it seems, only so much as the merits of the Communist question itself but rather on the principle that the small nations of the world must be unconditionally in the conviction that some principal source of protection lies within the legal guarantees provided by international law.

---

[55] *Yearbook*, 1956 (1957, Nov. 7, 1956, pp. 47-48.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

Respect for legal norms has served Uruguay well in her international relations during the twentieth century. As a small and militarily weak buffer state located between two powerful neighbors, she early realized the importance of stressing international law, rather than national power, as the desirable course to pursue on the international scene. Consequently, the principle of nonintervention, as well as considerations of national sovereignty and the juridical equality of states, have been the main pillars of her foreign policy. And just as the Charters of the OAS and the U.N. provide some measure of guarantee for these principles, so also does Uruguay aspire to an active role in these organizations in the effort to strengthen the principles which they endorse. The primary factor explaining Uruguay's position on the Dominican crisis in 1965, therefore, was this attempt by a small nation to maintain the delicate balance which exists in the world today between the observance of international law and the exercise of national power.

A second, and perhaps equally important, factor revealed in the Uruguayan position is the strong and reinforcing legalistic parallelism between her domestic and foreign policy. Domestically, Uruguay had been suffering from

Chapter XII

Conclusions

serious economic problems for the past decade, and at the time of the Dominican crisis, she was faced with a national bank scandal and a series of paralyzing strikes. The National Council of Government, hindered by its diffusion of authority and responsibility, was unable to cope effectively with the deteriorating economic situation. This resulted in the decision to schedule a national plebiscite in 1966 to consider the abolition of the collegiate executive form of government and a return to the presidential form of government. Whereas such unstable economic and political conditions might have provided the excuse in some countries of Latin America for a resort to unconstitutional means for their solution, in Uruguay they merely emphasized the need of employing legal methods, as had been done many times in the past. The emphasis on legal norms revealed in Uruguay's foreign policy during the Dominican crisis, therefore, served to reinforce the domestic legalism which was required to maintain her tradition of constitutional government during a period of internal crisis.

The position examined in this thesis, moreover, closely parallels the overall foreign policy, traditions, and principles which have guided Uruguay during this century and which have had as their primary objective the achievement of social justice within a stable constitutional environment. Uruguay's continuing concern for the movement for

social change in Latin America is a logical outgrowth of this tradition. Therefore, Uruguay feared that any action taken by an inter-American force to suppress the Dominican revolution might frustrate the democratic Left in Latin America and might tend to identify the OAS with the conservative Right--especially the military. Because of this, Uruguay opposed the creation of the Inter-American Force and refused to contribute troops to it. At the same time, she supported the U.N. presence in the Dominican Republic as a means of counter-balancing the activities of the OAS.

In conclusion, it should be noted that circumstances of geography, population, and resources will undoubtedly prevent Uruguay from ever reaching medium or great power status. As a substitute for national power, therefore, and until such time as the world is effectively regulated by law, it may be concluded that Uruguay will continue to play the role of the juridical gadfly in the field of international deliberations.

social change in Latin America is a logical outgrowth of this condition. Therefore, Uruguay feared that any action taken by an Inter-American force to suppress the Dominican revolution might structure the Democratic left in Latin America and might tend to identify the CAS with the conservative right--especially the military. Because of this, Uruguay opposed the creation of the Inter-American force and returned to conciliate groups in it. At the same time, she supported the U.S. presence in the Dominican Republic as a means of counter-balancing the hostility of the OAS.

In conclusion, it appears as though discontent of geography, population, and resources will undoubtedly prevent Uruguay from ever reaching medium or great power status. As a substitute for national power, therefore, and until such time as the world is effectively regulated by law, it may be considered that Uruguay will continue to play the role of the interested party in the field of international deliberations.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Official Publications

OAS. *Actas de las sesiones del consejo de la Organización de los Estados Americanos*. April 28-29, 1965. Washington: Pan American Union, 1965.

_____. *Décima reunión de consulta de ministros de relaciones exteriores*. Washington: Pan American Union, 1965.

_____. *Novena reunión de consulta de ministros de relaciones exteriores para servir de órgano de consulta en aplicación del tratado interamericano de asistencia recíproca*. Doc. 58. Washington: Pan American Union, 1964.

Pan American Union. *Uruguay*. American Republics Series, No. 20. Washington, 1962.

República oriental del Uruguay, Secretaria del Consejo Nacional de Gobierno. *Constitución*. Montevideo, 1952.

_____, Secretaria del Senado. *Tratados y convenios internacionales*. 2 vols. Montevideo, 1960.

United Nations, Security Council. *Draft Resolution, S/6328*. New York, 1965.

_____. *Draft Resolution, S/6346*. New York, 1965.

_____. *Resolution, S/Res/203*. New York, 1965.

_____. *Verbatim Minutes of the Meeting of the Security Council*. Meeting No. 1196; 1198; 1202-1204; 1208-1209; 1214-1217; 1221. New York, 1965.

United States Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations. *United States-Latin American Relations*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

U.S. *Department of State Bulletin*. Vol. XIII, November 25, 1945. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1945. Vol. LII, No. 1351 through 1357. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Official Publications

U.S. Cortes de las sesiones del consejo de la Organización de los Estados Americanos, April 15-17, 1965. Washington: Pan American Union, 1965.

_____. Séptima reunión de consulta de ministros de relaciones exteriores. Washington: Pan American Union, 1965.

_____. Novena reunión de consulta de ministros de relaciones exteriores para servir de órgano de consulta de aplicación del tratado interamericano de asistencia recíproca. Doc. 50. Washington: Pan American Union, 1964.

Pan American Union. Occupy. American Republics series, No. 10. Washington, 1962.

República oriental del Uruguay, Secretaría del Consejo Nacional de Gobierno. Constitución. Montevideo, 1952.

_____, Secretaría del Senado. Tratados y convenios internacionales. 2 vols. Montevideo, 1960.

United Nations, Security Council. Draft Resolution. S/5519. New York, 1965.

_____. Draft Resolution, S/6040. New York, 1965.

_____. Resolution, S/Res/203. New York, 1965.

_____. Verbatim Records of the Meeting of the Security Council. Meeting No. 1194[1 item] 1204-1207, 1209-1209, 1214-1217, 1221. New York, 1965.

United States Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations. United States-Latin American Relations. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1960.

U.S. Department of State Bulletin. Vol. XIII, November 23, 1945. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1945. Vol. XXII, No. 1353 through 1357. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books

Fitzgibbon, Russell H. Uruguay, Portrait of a Democracy. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954.

Johnson, John J. Political Change in Latin America. The Emergence of the Middle Sectors. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958.

Hanson, Simon G. Utopia in Uruguay. Chapters in the Economic History of Uruguay. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Hirschman, Albert O. (ed.). Latin American Issues. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 1961.

Pendle, George. Uruguay. Second edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

_____. Uruguay, South America's First Welfare State. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1952.

Pike, Fredrick B. (ed.). Freedom and Reform in Latin America. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959.

Taylor, Philip B., Jr. Government and Politics of Uruguay. New Orleans: The Tulane University Press, 1960.

_____. The Executive Power in Uruguay. Berkeley, California: University of California Berkeley Press, 1951.

Uruguayan Institute of International Law. Uruguay and the UN. New York: Manhattan Publishing Co., 1958.

Vanger, Milton I. José Batlle y Ordóñez of Uruguay. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

2. Periodicals

Szulc, Tad. "When the Marines Stormed Ashore in Santo Domingo," The Saturday Evening Post, July 31, 1965, pp. 36-46.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books

Fitzsimmons, Russell M. *Uruguay: Portrait of a Democracy*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954.

Johnson, John J. *Political Change in Latin America*. The Emergence of the Middle Sectors. Stanford University Press, 1958.

Hanson, Simon G. *Utopia in Uruguay*. Chapters in the Economic History of Uruguay. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

Kirkpatrick, Vincent C. (ed.). *Latin American Reforms*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 1951.

Pendle, George. *Uruguay*. Second edition. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.

_____. *Uruguay: South American Democracy*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1954.

Rice, Frederick R. (ed.). *Freedom and Reform in Latin America*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959.

Taylor, Philip B., Jr. *Government and Politics of Uruguay*. New Orleans: Tulane University Press, 1960.

_____. *The Executive Power in Uruguay*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1951.

Treasury Institute of International Law. *Uruguay and the UN*. New York: American Publishing Co., 1938.

Vanger, Milton I. *José Batlle y Ordóñez of Uruguay*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1963.

2. Periodicals

"Uruguay Ties Parking Record Above to Banto Decision," *The Saturday Evening Post*, July 31, 1960, pp. 25-26.

Taylor, Philip B., Jr. "The Uruguayan Coup d'État of 1933," The Hispanic American Historical Review, Vol. XXXII, August, 1952, pp. 301-302.

Visión. January, 1964-June, 1965.

Visión Letter. 1964-1965.

3. Newspapers

El País [Montevideo], April-June, 1965.

La Manana [Montevideo], April-June, 1965.

The Christian Science Monitor, April-June, 1965.

The New York Times. January, 1960-June, 1965.

The Washington Post. April-June, 1965.

Taylor, Philip M., Jr. "The Berquayron Case of 1913,"
The Historic American Electrical Review. Vol. XXIII.
August, 1932, pp. 301-302.

Vitality. January, 1934-June, 1961.

Vitality Central. 1926-1940.

3. Newspapers

El Pais [Conservative], April-June, 1961.

La Nueva [Democratic], April-June, 1961.

The Christian Science Monitor. April-June, 1961.

The New York Times. January, 1960-June, 1961.

The Washington Post. April-June, 1961.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

RESOLUTION CONVOKING THE TENTH MEETING OF CONSULTATION

WHEREAS:

The Ambassador Representative of Chile, on April 29, 1965, addressed a note to the Chairman of the Council in which his Government requested "that a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs be convoked for the first day of May 1965";

As the agenda for the aforesaid meeting, which would be held pursuant to the terms of Article 39 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Ambassador Representative of Chile has proposed the following:

"Serious situation created by armed strife in the Dominican Republic"; and

The urgency of the convocation makes it necessary to call attention to the provisions of Article 42 of the Charter of the OAS, adopting as regulations those approved by the Council at the meeting held on March 1, 1951, and designating the Pan American Union, in Washington, D. C., as the site of the meeting;

THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

RESOLVES:

1. To convoke, pursuant to Articles 39 and 40 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics for May 1, 1965.

2. To approve as the agenda of this meeting the following:

> "Serious situation created by the armed strife in the Dominican Republic."

3. To approve as the Regulations of the Conference those approved by the Council of the Organization of American States at the meeting held on March 1, 1951.

ANEXO 4

RESOLUCION CONVOCANDO UNA TERCERA REUNION

DE CONSULTACION

WHEREAS:

The Ambassador Representative of Chile, on April 28, 1965, requested a note to the Chairman of the Council in which the Government expressed "that a meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs is convoked for the first day of May 1965";

In the agenda for the aforesaid meeting, which would be held pursuant to the terms of Article 39 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Ambassador Representative of Chile has proposed the following:

"Actions attributable exclusively to the international Communist movement, which have as their purpose the establishment of a totalitarian regime in the Dominican Republic"; and

The carrying of the convocation makes it necessary to call attention to the provisions of Article 43 of the Charter of the OAS, adopting as regulations those approved by the Council at the meeting held on March 1, 1951, and designating the Pan American Union, in exception, E. C., as the site of the meeting;

THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

RESOLVES:

1. To convene, pursuant to Articles 39 and 40 of the Charter of the Organization of American States, a Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics for May 1, 1965.

2. To approve as the agenda of this meeting the following:

"Action attributable exclusively to the international Communist movement in the Dominican Republic."

3. To approve as the regulations of the conference those approved by the Council of the Organization of American States at the meeting held on March 1, 1951.

4. To designate the Pan American Union, Washington, D. C., as the site of the Meeting.

5. To request the Secretary General to inform the governments of the member states of the OAS of this decision, in the most rapid way possible, calling attention to the provisions of Article 42 of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

6. To appoint a committee to begin today to study the preparations for this Meeting, in the more urgent aspects not covered in this resolution.

4. To designate the Pan American Union, Washington, D. C., as the site of the Meeting.

5. To request the Secretary General to inform the governments of the remedy stated in the OAS of this decision, in the most expeditious way possible, calling attention to the provisions of Article 42 of the Charter of the Organization of American States.

6. To appoint a committee to begin early to study the preparations for this meeting, in the more urgent aspects not covered in this resolution.

APPENDIX B

RESOLUTION CALLING FOR CEASE-FIRE

THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

RESOLVES:

1. To reiterate the call of April 29, 1965 upon all the authorities, the political groupings, and the opposing forces to pursue immediately all possible means by which a cease-fire may be established and all hostilities and military operations suspended in order to prevent further tragic loss of life or injury as well as material damages in the sister Dominican Republic.

2. To make an urgent appeal to the same authorities, political groupings, and forces on both sides to permit the immediate establishment of an international neutral zone of refuge, encompassing the geographical area of the city of Santo Domingo immediately surrounding the embassies of foreign governments, the inviolability of which will be respected by all opposing forces and within which nationals of all countries will be given safe haven.

3. To inform the Security Council of the United Nations of the text of this resolution pursuant to Article 54 of the United Nations Charter.

APPENDIX C

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING OAS COMMITTEE

THE TENTH MEETING OF CONSULTATION OF MINISTERS OF

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

1. Decides to establish a committee composed of representatives of the following five member states: Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, and Panama;

2. Instructs the Committee to go immediately to the city of Santo Domingo, to do everything possible to obtain the re-establishment of peace and normal conditions, and to give priority to the following two functions:

a. To offer its good offices to the Dominican armed groups and political groups and to diplomatic representatives for the purpose of obtaining urgently:

i. a cease-fire; and
ii. the orderly evacuation of the persons who have taken asylum in the embassies and of all foreign citizens who desire to leave the Dominican Republic; and

b. To carry out an investigation of all aspects of the situation in the Dominican Republic that led to the convocation of this Meeting;

3. Requests the Committee to submit a report to the Meeting on the progress of its work, including the conclusions and recommendations that it may consider appropriate, in the shortest time possible;

4. Requests the American governments and the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to extend their full cooperation in order to facilitate the work of the Committee; and

5. Instructs the Secretary General of the Organization of American States to transmit to the Security Council of the United Nations the text of this resolution, in accordance with the provisions of Article 54 of the Charter of the United Nations.

ANNEXURE C

APPENDIX D

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING INTER-AMERICAN FORCE

WHEREAS:

This Meeting at its session of May 1, 1965, established a Committee to proceed to the Dominican Republic to seek the re-establishment of peace and normal conditions in the territory of that republic;

The said resolution requests the American governments and the General Secretariat of the Organization of American States to extend their full cooperation to facilitate the work of the Committee;

The formation of an inter-American force will signify ipso facto the transformation of the forces presently in Dominican territory into another force that will not be that of one state or of a group of states but that of the Organization of American States, which Organization is charged with the responsibility of interpreting the democratic will of its members;

The American states being under the obligation to provide reciprocal assistance to each other, the Organization is under greater obligation to safeguard the principles of the Charter and to do everything possible so that in situations such as that prevailing in the Dominican Republic appropriate measures may be taken leading to the re-establishment of peace and normal democratic conditions;

The Organization of American States being competent to assist the member states in the preservation of peace and the re-establishment of normal democratic conditions, it is also competent to provide the means that reality and circumstances require and that prudence counsels as adequate for the accomplishment of such purposes; and

The Committee of the Organization of American States that proceeded to the Dominican Republic, in its second report to this Meeting, advises the formation of an inter-American force to achieve the objectives determined by the Meeting of Consultation,

THE TENTH MEETING OF CONSULTATION OF MINISTERS OF

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

APPENDIX B

RESOLVES:

1. To request governments of member states that are willing and capable of doing so to make contingents of their land, naval, air or police forces available to the Organization of American States, within their capabilities and to the extent they can do so, to form an inter-American force that will operate under the authority of this Tenth Meeting of Consultation.

2. That this Force will have as its sole purpose, in a spirit of democratic impartiality, that of cooperating in the restoration of normal conditions in the Dominican Republic, in maintaining the security of its inhabitants and the inviolability of human rights, and in the establishment of an atmosphere of peace and conciliation that will permit the functioning of democratic institutions.

3. To request the commanders of the contingents of forces that make up this Force to work out directly among themselves and with a Committee of this Meeting the technical measures necessary to establish a Unified Command of the Organization of American States for the coordinated and effective action of the Inter-American Armed Force. In the composition of this Force an effort will be made to see that the national contingents will be progressively equalized.

4. That at such time as the OAS Unified Command shall have determined that the Inter-American Armed Force is adequate for the purposes contemplated by the resolution adopted by this Meeting on May 1, 1965, the full responsibility of meeting these purposes shall be assumed by that Force.

5. That the withdrawal of the Inter-American Force from the Dominican Republic shall be determined by this Meeting.

6. To continue in session in order to keep the situation under review, to receive the report and recommendations of the Committee, and in the light thereof to take the necessary steps to facilitate the prompt restoration of democratic order in the Dominican Republic.

7. To inform the Security Council of the United Nations of the text of this resolution.

RESOLVED:

4. To request governments of member states that are willing and capable of doing so to make contingents of their land, naval, air or police forces available to the organization of American States, within their capabilities and to the extent they can do so, to form an Inter-American force that will operate under the authority of this Tenth Meeting of Consultation.

5. That this force will have as its main purpose, in a spirit of democratic impartiality, that of cooperating in the restoration of normal conditions in the Dominican Republic, in maintaining the security of the inhabitants and the inviolability of human rights, and in the establishment of an atmosphere of peace and conciliation that will permit the functioning of democratic institutions.

6. To request the immediate withdrawal of the contingents of forces that make up this Inter-American Force as the circumstances and with a tendency to this fusting the successful performance and to establish a United Command of the Organization of American States for the coordinated and effective action of the Inter-American Armed Forces. In the composition of this force an effort will be made to see that the national contingents will be proportionately equitable.

7. That at such time as the Organ of United Command shall have determined that the Inter-American Armed Force is adequate for the purpose contemplated by the resolution adopted by this Meeting on May 1, 1965, the full exercise of the responsibility of meeting those purposes shall be assumed by that Force.

8. That the authority of the Inter-American Force from the Dominican Republic shall be determined by this Meeting.

9. To continue in session in order to take the situation under review, to receive the report and recommendations of the Committee, and in the light thereof to take the necessary steps to facilitate the normal restoration of democratic order in the Dominican Republic.

10. To inform the Security Council of the United Nations of the text of this resolution.

APPENDIX E

URUGUAYAN DRAFT RESOLUTION OF MAY 11, 1965

The Security Council,

Having considered the situation existing in the Dominican Republic,

Taking note of the communications dated 29 April, 30 April, 1 May, 3 May and 6 May 1965 from the Organization of American States, reporting on the measures taken by that Organization in connexion with the situation existing in the Dominican Republic,

Having regard to Articles 24, 34 and 35, and the relevant provisions of Chapter VIII, of the Charter of the United Nations,

Reaffirming the principles set forth in Chapter I of the Charter of the United Nations and, in particular, in Article 2, paragraphs 4 and 7,

Having particular regard also to the provisions of Articles 15 and 17 of the Charter of the Organization of American States,

1. Expresses its deep concern at the recent developments in the Dominican Republic;

2. Reaffirms the right of the people of the Dominican Republic freely to exercise, without coercion of any kind, their sovereign right of self-determination;

3. Urgently appeals to all contending factions in the Dominican Republic to cease hostilities and to make every possible effort to achieve a peaceful and democratic settlement of their differences;

4. Invites the Secretary-General to follow closely the events in the Dominican Republic and to take such measures as he may deem appropriate for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on all aspects of the situation;

5. Invites the Organization of American States to keep the Security Council promptly and fully informed of the

ANNEXURE C

action taken by the Organization of American States with respect to the situation existing in the Dominican Republic;

6. Also invites the Organization of American States to co-operate with the Secretary-General of the United Nations in the implementation of this resolution.

APPENDIX F

SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION OF MAY 14, 1965

The Security Council,

Deeply concerned at the grave events in the Dominican Republic,

1. Calls for strict cease-fire;

2. Invites the Secretary-General to send, as an urgent measure, a representative to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on the present situation;

3. Calls upon all concerned in the Dominican Republic to co-operate with the representative of the Secretary-General in the carrying out of this task.

APPENDIX A

DECISION CONTROL DIRECTIVE 67 MAY 19, 1965

TO: The Security Council

SUBJECT: Problems concerned at this grave moment in the Dominican Republic

1. Carry the matter case-file.

2. Outline the secretary-General to study as an urgent measure, 3 representatives to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of reporting to the Security Council on the present situation.

3. Shall have all cooperation Sequoia to co-operate with ECA representative at the Secretary-General in the carrying out of this task.

thesF269
Uruguayan policy in respect to the Unite
3 2768 002 06572 4
DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY